United Nations ECE/CES/2015/4

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
1 April 2015

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-third plenary session
Geneva, 15-17 June 2015
Item 5 (d) of the provisional agenda
Statistical Framework for Measuring Quality of Employment

Statistical Framework for Measuring Quality of Employment

Note by the Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment

Summary

The paper provides an extract of the draft Statistical Framework for Measuring Quality of Employment. This extract defines the concept of quality of employment, presents the elements and principles of the Statistical Framework and introduces the dimensions of quality of employment with the respective indicators. The paper also includes a list of issues for further work and guidance on using the indicators.

The Statistical Framework was developed by the Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment, chaired by Germany. The Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians reviewed the Statistical Framework in October 2014, supported the Framework and decided to submit it to the 2015 plenary session of the Conference of European Statisticians.

The full text of the Statistical Framework has been sent to all members of the Conference for electronic consultation. Subject to positive outcome of the consultation, the Framework will be submitted to the 2015 plenary session of the Conference of European Statisticians for endorsement.

GE.15-06925 (E)

1506925

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The Statistical Framework for Measuring Quality of Employment was prepared by the Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment, established by the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES). It aims at providing a clear and coherent structure for measuring quality of employment. Quality of employment is approached as a multidimensional concept, characterised by different elements, which relate to human needs in various ways. To cover all relevant aspects, the framework identifies seven dimensions and twelve sub-dimensions of quality of employment:

(a) Safety and ethics of employment:
- Safety at work;
- Child labour and forced labour;
- Fair treatment in employment;

(b) Income and benefits from employment:
- Income;
- Non-wage pecuniary benefits;

(c) Working time and work-life balance:
- Working hours;
- Working time arrangements;
- Work life balance;

(d) Security of employment and social protection:
- Security of employment;
- Social protection;

(d) Social dialogue;

(e) Skills development and training;

(f) Employment-related relationships and work motivation:
- Employment-related relationships;
- Work motivation.

2. For each dimension and sub-dimension, the framework presents a number of statistical indicators that may be produced. The annex of the statistical framework includes the full list of indicators for measuring quality of employment together with detailed indicator sheets for the indicators, which provide operational definitions and suggest guidelines for compiling and interpreting the indicators. The framework is intended to allow flexibility to meet the needs of countries that wish to analyse the quality of employment, according to specific national policy requirements and institutional backgrounds of countries. The framework also includes suggestions for context information that should be considered to facilitate the interpretation of the indicators on quality of employment. Context information may include statistical indicators on the economic and social context of employment, employment opportunities (e. g. employment-to-population ratio, unemployment rate) as well as information regarding the legal and institutional context of employment.

3. The conceptual framework defines quality of employment from the point of view of the employed person. It refers to the entirety of aspects of employment that may affect the well-being of employed persons. This may differ from the point of view of the employer or the society as a whole. The framework acknowledges that different aspects of quality of employment may be perceived differently by different individuals. The proposed indicators are defined in such a way that allows assessment for specific subpopulation groups, such as women compared to men, young or older workers compared to middle aged, lower compared to higher-educated persons, migrants compared to nationals or inhabitants of different regions.

4. In the process of reviewing the dimensions and developing the indicators (as well as the indicator sheets), the Expert Group has drawn on the relevant international standards and the existing international research. In particular, the standards adopted by the International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) and the International Labour Conference (ILC) served as important references in developing the framework and indicator sheets. The relevance of the indicators is well established on these grounds, although the statistical framework avoids value judgement, e.g. regarding the distinction of "high quality" and "low quality" employment. The presentation of the statistical framework, together with the indicator sheets, elaborates further on why the indicators have been selected and their importance in the context of measuring quality of employment. Still, any value judgement is left to the users of the statistics.

5. The framework acknowledges other international efforts that have been undertaken in the area of measuring quality of employment. Both the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the European Union (EU) have developed indicators for related purposes. In contrast to other indicator sets, the proposed statistical framework is not linked to a particular policy agenda. The framework is considered a statistical toolbox that provides practical guidance to countries that wish to compile statistics on quality of employment. Despite the different objectives of other international frameworks, the former Task Forces and the current Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment have reviewed the underlying concepts and variables used in other frameworks in order to ensure conceptual consistency to the greatest extent possible. ILO, Eurostat and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) contributed actively to the development of the statistical framework to achieve this objective.

6. The framework stresses the need for continued research and exchange of experience at the international level to keep it up-to-date. Changes in labour markets may necessitate the development of additional indicators or make existing ones obsolete. A few indicators are earmarked as experimental, as the Expert Group felt the need to develop further experiences. The document identifies a list of research areas that are recommended to be considered for further research.

II. Background

7. Quality of employment is an important issue for society, policy makers, governments and researchers. In many countries, the heterogeneity of employment types has increased over the last few decades. Non-standard types of employment have grown substantially, while the share of standard full-time jobs with open ended contracts has decreased. These issues underscore the importance of collecting more systematic information on the quality of employment in order to complement the well-established quantitative labour market indicators.

8. Employment is central to the life of people in many countries, not only in terms of providing income. Employment influences quality of life in many respects: it is often the key to social and economic advancement, it provides one with a sense of identity and it offers opportunities to socialise with others. At the same time, employment is not without risk. Some types of employment can have negative implications on health and also restrict opportunities in non-working life.[1] Quality of employment may play an important part in countries that are faced with the problem of an ageing labour force, as it is a key factor to enhance sustainability of employment.[2]

9. In many countries, employment situations differ significantly across demographic and social population groups, as well as across (national) regions. For example, the characteristics of employment of men and women differ in many respects. Hence, quality of employment needs to be measured not only for all employed persons, but also for relevant sub-groups, such as men and women, young and old workers or natives and migrants.

10. Many international organisations emphasise the importance of quality of employment in their work. The main purpose of the ILO's work is *"to promote opportunities for men and women to obtain decent and productive work"*[3]. The ILO's work includes a focus on worker rights; employment creation; social protection; and social dialogue between workers' organisations, employers' organisations and governments. In Europe, the Europe 2020 strategy identified employment and job quality as essential elements for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.[4] The promotion of quality of work is a "guiding principle" in the Social Policy Agenda of the EU. In 2000, heads of State and Governments of the EU set the *"overall goal of moving to full employment through creating not only more, but also better jobs"*.[5] Subsequent meetings of the European Council have also concluded that promoting quality and productivity at work is a priority for the EU.

11. OECD has launched important activities to follow up on the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission through the OECD 'Better Life Initiative' as well as a project on defining, measuring and assessing job quality. In the report, *How's Life?*, there are several components of well-being related to the measurement of the quality of employment (for example, jobs and earnings and work-life balance) and due reference is given to the work of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) on the topic.[6] Several other initiatives to implement the recommendations of the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi-Commission took the UNECE's work on measuring quality of employment as the reference frame for this part of their

[1] See e.g. Stiglitz, Joseph; Sen, Amartya; Fitoussi, Jean-Paul, 2009: *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. At www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr, p. 49

[2] See, e.g., Europfound, 2008: *Working conditions of an ageing workforce*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities2008.

[3] Juan Somavia, former ILO Director-General, as stated at http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/mission-and-objectives/lang--en/index.htm, October 25, 2012.

[4] European Commission: Employment and Social Developments in Europe 2011. At http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esde/2011.

[5] Lozano, Esteban, 2005: *Quality in work: Dimensions and Indicators in the Framework of the European Employment Strategy*, UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Seminar on the Quality of Work, Geneva, May 11 to 13, 2005, p. 2.

[6] OECD, 2011: *How's Life ? Measuring Well-Being*. OECD, Paris, 2011. OECD, 2014: *How good is your job? Measuring and assessing job quality*. In: OECD (ed.): Employment Outlook 2014, pp. 79-139.

work.[7] In Australia, a large scale consultation about the indicator set "Measures of Australia's Progress" (MAP) confirmed the importance of quality of paid work as an essential part of people's lives. The consultation identified income, job satisfaction, flexible arrangements, safe and healthy working conditions and effective industrial relations environments as elements of quality of employment.[8]

12. To assist countries with monitoring and developing their policies to improve quality of employment, both ILO and EU have developed sets of statistical indicators. The ILO indicators for the measurement of decent work are grouped under eleven substantive elements, which cover the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda: employment creation, guaranteeing rights at work, extending social protection and promoting social dialogue. The Decent Work indicators presented at the 18th ICLS in 2008 include a set of statistical indicators combined with "indicators" on the legal framework. Within the EU, two sets of indicators are used. One set of indicators is maintained by the European Commission for monitoring labour market policies. Another set was developed and is in use by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound).

13. The purpose of UNECE's work on quality of employment, which dates back to 2000, is to develop a statistical framework for measuring quality of employment. In contrast to the other existing indicator sets, the statistical framework is not linked to a particular policy agenda and therefore does not monitor progress towards specified targets. It has been developed as a statistical toolbox that can be applied flexibly and used in various contexts, according to the specific policy requirements and institutional backgrounds of countries. In the development of the framework, two Task Forces were created in 2005 and 2007 under the auspices of CES in order to work on the methodology for measuring quality of employment. The 2007 Task Force developed a framework for measuring quality of employment with 7 dimensions and over 50 indicators, following a series of implementation studies. The framework was implemented by at least 9 countries by the end of the Task Force's term.[9] A first version of the present document was drafted by the 2007 Task Force.

14. The current Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment was established in February 2012 comprising Azerbaijan, Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Germany (chair), Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Eurostat, Eurofound, ILO, OECD, UNECE (secretariat) and Women in Informal Employment Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO). The Expert Group has the following objectives:

(a) Review and revise the conceptual structure of measuring quality of employment as outlined in the *Report on Potential Indicators for Measurement of Quality of Employment*;

[7] See, e.g., *Monitoring Economic Performance, Quality of Life and Sustainability*. Joint Report as requested by the Franco-German Ministerial Council. Paris, Wiesbaden 2010.

[8] Australian Bureau of Statistics: Measures of Australia's Progress. Aspirations for our nation: A conversation with Australians about progress, p. 91. At http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/1370.0.00.002

[9] UNECE, 2010: *Measuring Quality of Employment, Country Pilot Reports*. UNECE, Geneva, 2010.

(b) Revise the set of indicators of quality of employment in order to reflect the issues that were raised at the 58th CES plenary session, in country reports and during the Expert Group meeting on 31 October-2 November 2011 and;

(c) Develop operational definitions and computation guidelines (including on data sources and limitations) for quality of employment indicators.

15. This document introduces the statistical framework for measuring quality of employment, specifies the objectives and structure of the framework and introduces a list of recommended indicators for measuring quality of employment. The annexes include the list of indicators as well as detailed *indicator sheets* for all of the indicators. These indicator sheets provide operational definitions and detailed guidelines for compiling the indicators as well as for their interpretation in the context of quality of employment.

III. The concept of quality of employment

16. The statistical framework follows the definition of employment endorsed by the *Resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilisation* adopted by the 19th ICLS held in October 2013.[10] This Resolution (hereafter referred to as the 19th ICLS Resolution on work statistics) presents not only refinements to existing ICLS standards on conceptual definitions and guidelines on the labour force and related components, but also a new framework and guidelines for measuring different forms of work as well as recommendations on measures of labour underutilisation. According to this Resolution, *work* is defined as any activity performed by persons of any sex and age to produce goods or to provide services for use by others or for own use. This definition of work is consistent with the *general* production boundary of the System of National Accounts (SNA) and enables full compilation of national production accounts and satellite accounts. *Employment work* refers to work performed (for use by other units) in exchange for pay or profit. The form of work identified as employment at the same time sets the reference scope for the definition of the *labour force*. The concept of the labour force refers to the current supply of labour for the production of goods and services in exchange for pay or profit.

17. According to the 19th ICLS Resolution on work statistics, *persons in employment* are defined as all those of working age who, during a short reference period, either worked in a job for pay or profit for at least one hour or were temporarily absent from such a job in which they had already worked. *Pay or profit* refers to work done as part of a transaction in exchange for remuneration, which may be payable either as wages or salaries for time worked or work done, or as profit (or loss) derived through market transactions from the goods and/or services produced. Remuneration may be in cash or in kind, whether actually received or not. The 19th ICLS Resolution on work statistics defines a *job* as a set of tasks and duties performed, or meant to be performed, by one person for a single economic unit. Persons may have one or several jobs. Notably, many quality of employment indicators, including those related to employment-related income and working time,

[10] *Resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilization,* adopted by the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (October 2013). Available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/standards-and-guidelines/resolutions-adopted-by-international-conferences-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_230304/lang--en/index.htm

should ideally cover all jobs of multiple jobholders since the perspective of the employed person is taken into account. This is a feature distinguishing the quality of employment framework from a job quality framework. In cases where the main job is used as the reference among multiple job-holders, the main job should refer to the one with the longest hours usually worked.[11]

18. In accordance with the importance of multiple job holding in a given country, countries may decide to focus on the main job when calculating indicators on quality of employment. It is recommended to provide information regarding secondary job(s) whenever necessary. Still, countries should take into account that more detailed information tends to be available for the main job. If information is provided for both main and secondary job(s), it should be provided in breakdown by main and secondary jobs (e.g. concerning earnings or working hours) in order not to restrict the analytical potential.

19. The statistical framework was designed for measuring the quality of employment (i.e. work for pay or profit). Many dimensions and indicators could however also be relevant for other types of work, for instance own-use production of goods and unpaid trainee work. According to national circumstances, countries may consider extending the scope of parts of the indicators to other forms of work, if deemed necessary. In this case, it is however recommended to provide breakdowns by form of work. In the case of sub-dimension 1b (Child labour and forced labour), a broader scope is suggested as the restriction to employment work does not seem appropriate in this specific case.

20. Quality of employment is a complex concept. Its definition and components depend on whether quality of employment is assessed from the perspective of the society, the corporation or the individual.[12] Of course there are overlaps between the societal, corporate and individual views on what constitutes high quality employment. Both employers and workers, for example, presumably have a strong interest in reducing accidents in employment. Likewise, workers usually have an interest in working for a profitable enterprise. However, one can also imagine contrasting views. For example, what an employee might see as "high wages" (to his or her benefit) the employer might view as high labour costs weighing down the firm's profits.

21. The Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment adopts the individual's perspective on quality of employment. Quality of employment can be defined as the entirety of aspects of employment that may affect the well-being of employed persons. In other words, quality of employment refers to the conditions and ethics of employment, monetary and non-pecuniary benefits, working time arrangements and work-life balance, employment security and social protection, skills development and training as well as work motivation and employment-related relationships of an individual. Employment is not only analysed as a source of income, but also as providing social security, identity and self-esteem. The quality of

[11] *Resolution concerning the measurement of working time*, adopted by the Eighteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (November-December 2008). Available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/standards-and-guidelines/resolutions-adopted-by-international-conferences-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_112455/lang--en/index.htm

[12] Vermeylen, Greet, 2005: *Quality in work and employment in the European Working Conditions Survey*, Working Paper no. 4 UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Seminar on the Quality of Work, Geneva, May 11 to 13, 2005, p.2, available at: http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/2005/05/labour/wp.4.e.pdf

employment for a person with more than one job ideally takes important characteristics of the secondary job(s) into account.

22. Quality of employment is a multidimensional concept, characterised by many different facets, or dimensions, which relate to human needs in various ways. These dimensions are not hierarchical and no single dimension is more important than another. For example, *income and benefits from employment* and *security of employment and social protection* are both dimensions of quality of employment, but it is difficult to argue that decent pay is more important than a secure job or vice versa. Albeit closely interlinked, the dimensions are also to some degree independent from one another. The situation in one dimension cannot necessarily be deduced from the situation in others.

23. The assessment will also be influenced by the specific socio-economic context. For example, a country's view of quality of employment for those with few hours of work may differ during a time of recession compared to a period of strong growth. Similarly, the definition of "high quality" or "low quality" jobs may differ across countries depending on average levels of income across countries.

24. Quality of employment also has a subjective component. An employment characteristic may be perceived as highly rewarding by one worker and as stressful by another. For example, some might see working part-time as a good opportunity to combine work and family life, whereas others might emphasise reduced income opportunities of part-time jobs or implications for their level of social security. Also, job perceived as favourable in one phase of life might be viewed differently in another one.

25. In the process of identifying dimensions and relevant indicators, statisticians can draw on existing international standards, such as the Resolutions and Guidelines adopted by ICLS and the Declarations, Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the ILO International Labour Conference (ILC), as well as a rich body of international research. Internationally, there is a broad consensus that some types of employment should be abolished. This is the case for child labour and forced labour. Although the framework avoids value judgement, such cases are in no way relativised. Furthermore, a body of international research over many decades has provided evidence that specific employment situations can adversely affect a person's quality of life.[13] For example, working long hours can have negative health implications and often has a negative impact on work-life balance. This does not imply, however, that certain types of employment are considered per se "low" quality. The impact will depend on the institutional and cultural context as well as the personal characteristics and preferences of the worker. The rationale of the selection of the dimensions and sub-dimensions, as well as the indicators is elaborated further in section IV. The indicator sheets include further explanations for each indicator as well as specific references to existing research.

[13] For recent examples, see, e.g. Green, Francis, 2006: *Demanding work. The paradox of job quality in affluent economy*. Princeton and Oxford: Oxford University Press. Kalleberg, Arne L., 2011: *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs. The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s to 2000s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Guillén, Ana M. and Svenn-Åge Dahl (eds.), 2009: *Quality of Work in the European Union. Concept, Data and Debates from a Transnational Perspective*. Brussels: Peter Lang. Gallie, Duncan (ed.), 2007: *Employment Regimes and the Quality of Work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Muñoz de Bustillo, Rafael et al, 2011: *Measuring More Than Money – The Social Economics of Job Quality*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

26. Official statistics has an important role to play by providing relevant, reliable and impartial statistical information that can be used to understand and interpret the elements of quality of employment. Producers of official statistics should compile and release data on an objective basis determined by statistical considerations only. While statisticians can analyse the correlation between certain aspects of employment and the employed persons' well-being, they should not make value judgments about what is considered "high quality" or "low quality" employment.

IV. Elements and principles of the statistical framework

27. The statistical framework presented in this paper specifies the concept of quality of employment in seven dimensions. The dimensions are further subdivided into sub-dimensions where appropriate. In each of the dimensions and sub-dimensions, the framework proposes a list of statistical indicators. Detailed descriptions of each indicator - indicator sheets – have been developed to provide guidance for the computation and interpretation of the indicators. The Expert Group believes that the framework is comprehensive enough to support work by a diverse set of countries.

28. The framework provides a conceptual structure that can be used to give a comprehensive picture of quality of employment. It can be seen as a toolbox for compiling data and calculating indicators on quality of employment. The dimensions and the indicators proposed were selected on the basis of recognised research on quality of employment and studies in countries. The framework adheres to the UN Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics, which stipulate that official statistics should be relevant and impartial and that the methods and procedures for the collection, processing, storage and presentation of statistical data should be based on strictly professional considerations.[14] The framework does not include judgements regarding the distinction of "high quality" and "low quality" employment, but includes indicators for their relevance to quality of employment. Any value judgement is left to the users of the data.

29. Some information related to quality of employment may be available in one country but not in another. In the view of the Expert Group, it may not be possible or efficient for each country to produce exactly the same information. Rather, the approach here is to provide a comprehensive set of indicators which countries may draw from. Countries are free to select those indicators from the framework that they deem useful considering their national circumstances, as well as to choose the suitable data source.

30. It is important to note that no single indicator can provide a holistic view of trends in quality of employment. Therefore a variety of indicators should be analysed jointly in order to provide a comprehensive picture.

31. The statistical framework is designed to help users measuring quality of employment from the individual's perspective. In other words, the framework for measuring quality of employment is based on the components (dimensions and sub-dimensions) of quality of employment that are relevant to the employed person. This approach is quite similar to what is proposed in recent conceptual work where job

[14] See the UN *Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics*, available at: http://www.unece.org/stats/archive/docs.fp.e.html

quality is defined as the characteristics of employment that affect the well-being of the worker.[15]

32. The difference between the statistical framework for measuring quality of employment and other existing frameworks is that this framework has been developed as a statistical toolbox that can be used in various contexts and does not aim to monitor progress towards targets in a given policy agenda.

33. Interested countries can use the relevant components of the statistical framework based on their requirements and according to the policy needs in their country. Despite the different objectives of other international frameworks, the former Task Forces and the current Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment have reviewed the underlying concepts and variables used in other frameworks in order to ensure conceptual consistency to the greatest extent possible.

34. The following principles were followed in the development of the statistical framework for measuring quality of employment:

(a) The dimensions, sub-dimensions and indicators of quality of employment are organised using a transparent, logical structure;

(b) All dimensions, sub-dimensions and indicators are clearly relevant for quality of employment, demonstrated by empirical research and country experiences;

(c) The dimensions, sub-dimensions and indicators for measuring quality of employment are sufficiently broad to allow countries the necessary adaptations to national circumstances;

(d) Each indicator of quality of employment is of sufficient importance at least within a group of countries to justify measurement;

(e) The statistics of quality of employment are technically feasible to produce, but the current availability of data did not drive the selection of indicators. While the framework is designed to draw from existing sources, countries may need to consider expanding the collection of statistics on quality of employment where desirable;

(f) The indicators are developed, wherever possible, using international recommendations and guidelines on classifications, concepts, definitions and computation methods and definitions. The indicators are those which both National Statistical Offices (NSOs) and other statistics-producing bodies find appropriate to provide data for.

35. The first principle relates to the organisation of the indicators, which is based on individual needs from employment. The second, third and fourth principles ensure that comprehensive, varied indicators allow countries to measure quality of employment for employed persons by age, economic activity, occupation group or status in employment. The fifth principle ensures practicality, suggesting simple indicators that can be produced using data collection programmes common in many countries, such as population censuses or household surveys (for example, labour force surveys). This aims to facilitate ease of use, although it is of lower priority; practicality is important, but simply choosing what is currently available would not encourage statistical development. The sixth principle relates the indicators to the

[15] Muñoz de Bustillo, Rafael et al., 2011: *Measuring more than money: The social economics of job quality*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham 2011.

international standards that are currently in place, for example, the standards adopted by ICLS.

36. The statistical framework includes two types of indicators: "objective" and "subjective" indicators. It should be noted that it is not always straightforward to draw a clear line between "objective" and "subjective" indicators, as the perception of the respondents is often involved to some degree when measuring factual information. Countries that do not consider the use of "subjective" indicators relevant are free to restrict their choice to the other indicators.

37. The conceptual framework focuses on quality aspects of employment. For this reason, general labour market indicators, such as unemployment rates, are considered outside the scope of the quality of employment indicators. Nevertheless, reflecting the importance of this information for the interpretation of many indicators, such general labour market indicators are included in the framework as context information.

38. Information regarding the legal and institutional context in a given country often further facilitates the interpretation of indicators on quality of employment. The Expert Group recommends that countries consider the list of legal framework indicators developed in the ILO's Decent Work measurement framework by referring to the ILO Decent work indicators manual.[16]

39. The guiding principles, dimensions and sub-dimensions of the framework may be updated from time to time, but should remain relatively stable. The list of indicators, and in particular the indicator sheets, however, should be periodically reviewed in order to remain relevant in light of changes of employment types and patterns (see section V).

V. Defining the dimensions of quality of employment

40. This section defines the dimensions and sub-dimensions of the framework and explains the importance of each of the dimensions for quality of employment. The structure of the framework is intended to cover human needs that may be satisfied through employment. The proposed seven dimensions of quality of employment are illustrated in Figure 1.

41. The dimensions and sub-dimensions of the framework for measuring quality of employment are presented below. It is important to note that the ordering of the dimensions does not imply any hierarchy among the dimensions and each may be considered equally important.

(a) Safety and ethics of employment:

- Safety at work;
- Child labour and forced labour;
- Fair treatment in employment;

(b) Income and benefits from employment:

- Income;

[16] International Labour Organisation, 2013: *Decent Work Indicators. Guidelines for Producers and Users of Statistical and Legal Framework Indicators*. ILO Manual, Second version, Geneva: ILO.

- Non-wage pecuniary benefits;

(c) Working time and work-life balance:

- Working hours;
- Working time arrangements;
- Work-life balance;

(d) Security of employment and social protection:

- Security of employment;
- Social protection;

(e) Social dialogue;

(f) Skills development and training;

(g) Employment-related relationships and work motivation:

- Employment-related relationships;
- Work motivation.

Figure 1
The dimensions of quality of employment

Quality of Employment
1 Safety and ethics of employment
2 Income and benefits from employment
3 Working Time and work-life balance
4 Security of Employment and social protection
5 Social dialogue
6 Skills development and training
7 employment-related relationships and work motivation

42. The list of indicators is based on the list of potential indicators endorsed by CES at its fifty-eighth plenary session in June 2010.[17] This list of indicators had previously been tested in various ways: Nine country profiles were prepared, which were sponsored by the International Labour Organisation and used funds provided by the European Union. In addition, a validation study had been conducted by the Italian National Statistical Institute (ISTAT).[18] Further independent country reports have also applied these indicators in different national contexts.

43. The current Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment proposed revisions of this list of indicators in order to incorporate comments given at the fifty-eighth Plenary Session of the CES and to reflect issues raised in the country reports to date and at the Sixth Meeting of the Group of Experts on Measuring Quality of Employment (31 October-2 November 2011). The revision also incorporated the changes made necessary by the adoption of the *Resolution on statistics of work, employment and labour underutilisation* by the 19th ICLS in 2013. Further suggestions were made to revise, remove, add or replace indicators to enhance relevant measurement in all dimensions of quality of employment. Specifications of the indicators regarding definition and formula, measurement objectives, recommended disaggregations, data sources as well as limitations and interpretation guidelines are to be found in the indicator sheets.

A. Dimension 1: Safety and ethics of employment

44. The dimension on safety and ethics of employment focuses both on physical safety and conditions at work, physical health and mental well-being, as well as the rights and treatment of the person in employment. In this way, the dimension is a fundamental component of quality of employment, as physical well-being and the application of internationally accepted human rights and labour conventions are essential to ensure high quality employment. The indicators under this dimension provide general information on workplace injuries, forms of labour such as child and forced labour, and unfair treatment.

1. Sub-dimension 1a: Safety at work

45. The physical safety and health aspect of quality of employment is covered by the sub-dimension *Safety at work*. Risks of injury or death can exist across all types of employment, and thus indicators of safety at work are an important element of quality of employment.

[17] UNECE, 2010: *Potential indicators for measurement of quality of employment. Note by the secretariat.* Conference of European Statisticians, fifty-eighth plenary session, 8–10 June 2010, document ECE/CES/2010/9. Available at: www.unece.org/stats/documents/ece/ces/2010/9.e.pdf

[18] See ISTAT, 2009: *A Validation Study of the Quality of Employment Indicators.* Prepared for the Task Force on the Measurement of Quality of Employment. Rome: ISTAT 2009. Available at: http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/qualityofemployment/Validation%20Study_QoE.pdf

Indicators in sub-dimension 1a Safety at Work		
1a1	Fatal occupational injuries	Rate of fatal occupational injuries per 100,000 employed persons
1a2	Nonfatal occupational injuries	Rate of nonfatal occupational injuries per 100,000 employed persons
1a3	Exposure to physical health risk factors	Percentage of employed persons who are exposed to physical health risk factors at work
1a4	Exposure to mental health risk factors	Percentage of employed persons who are exposed to mental well-being risk factors at work

2. Sub-dimension 1b: Child labour and forced labour

46. The sub-dimension *Child labour and forced labour* is closely related to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and other international conventions requiring that certain types of work should be abolished, in particular child labour and forced labour. Against this background, protecting children from economic exploitation and from work that is dangerous to their health and morals is a key element of quality of employment as is the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour. For this reason, *Child labour and forced labour* is included as a separate sub-dimension of quality of employment. The 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians in 2008 adopted the Resolution concerning statistics of child labour, which contains concepts, definitions and methods of data collection on child labour, including its worst forms.[19]

Indicators in sub-dimension 1b Child Labour and Forced Labour		
1b1	Child labour rate	Percentage of children aged 5 to 17 years who are engaged in child labour
1b2	Hazardous child labour rate	Percentage of children aged 5 to 17 years who are engaged in hazardous child labour
1b3	Forced labour rate	Percentage of persons who are in forced labour
1b4	Forced labour rate among returned migrants	Percentage of returned labour migrants who were in forced labour
1bx	Other worst forms of child labour (experimental)	Percentage of children aged 5 to 17 years who are engaged in worst forms of child labour other than hazardous work

[19] The ILO's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) has worked extensively in this area. The ILO Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC), which is the statistical branch of IPEC, supports countries in the development of statistics on the level, characteristics and determinants of child labour.

3. Sub-dimension 1c: Fair treatment in employment

47. The elimination of discrimination in respect to employment and occupation is another one of the four ILO Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. Discrimination at work includes any less favourable treatment that is explicitly or implicitly based on particular grounds, such as sex, race, etc. (direct discrimination), or, although neutral on the surface, the same condition, treatment or criterion leading in practice to a harsh impact on some persons on the basis of characteristics such as race, colour, sex, etc. (indirect discrimination). Discrimination at work denies opportunities for individuals who may, for example, be denied equal pay or the access to managerial positions or may experience less favourable working conditions. The 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalisation underlines the particular importance of gender equality and non-discrimination as a strategic cross-cutting aspect of quality of employment.

Indicators in sub-dimension 1c Fair treatment in employment

For the measurement of fair treatment, users should consider the demographic or social groups relevant given the national circumstances. It is recommended to always provide breakdowns by sex and age groups. Groups for which fair treatment could be an issue include sex, ethnic groups, immigrants, indigenous population groups, persons with disabilities, age groups, and geographic regions. Furthermore, the following specific indicators on fair treatment should be included.

1c1	Pay gap	Pay gap between subpopulation groups (e.g., gender pay gap)
1c2	Access to managerial occupations	Percentage of employed persons in population subgroups (e.g., women) in managerial occupations (ISCO-08 major group 1)
1c3	Discrimination at work	Percentage of employed persons who have been a victim of discrimination at work

B. Dimension 2: Income and benefits from employment

48. The employment-related income that people receive is clearly an important component of quality of employment. A motivation shared by most employed persons is to earn their living. Most people depend on income from employment for their material well-being. Moreover, people value payment for their work, but they also consider the leave, health coverage and other benefits provided by their work when asking themselves "what is a good job?"[20]

49. The concept of income from employment is framed broadly to include earnings to employees (which includes wages and salaries as well as certain non-wage benefits such as paid leave, as defined below) and also income related to self-employment (also defined below).

[20] In a survey conducted on about 2,500 Canadians, over half of the respondents said that benefits were "very important" in a job, while over 6 in ten said that good pay was very important. Interestingly, the same survey compared what workers want in a job to what they feel they actually get. The largest "job quality deficits" were noted in pay, benefits and the related concept of advancement opportunities.

1. Sub-dimension 2a: Income from employment

50. The sub-dimension *Income from employment* provides information on the earnings paid to employees as well as income from self-employment. The concept of earnings was defined in the *Resolution concerning an integrated system of wages statistics*[21] adopted by the Twelfth ICLS in 1973. The statistical measure of earnings is based on the concept of wages as income to the employee. Earnings should relate to employees' gross remuneration, that is, total earnings before deductions by an employer for taxes and also deductions of contributions of employees to social security, pensions, life insurance premiums, union dues etc. The term earnings refers solely to remuneration paid to employees by an employer and excludes remuneration received by self-employed workers.

Indicators in sub-dimension 2a Income from employment

2a1	Average earnings	Mean nominal monthly / hourly earnings of employees (local currency)
2a2	Employees with low pay	Percentage of employees with low pay
2a3	Earnings by deciles	Nominal monthly / hourly earnings of employees by deciles (local currency)
2a4	Employment-related income of self-employed	Employment-related income of self-employed by deciles (local currency)

2. Sub-dimension 2b: Non-wage pecuniary benefits

51. The sub-dimension *Non-wage pecuniary benefits* refers to benefits provided by the employer that are non-monetary benefits. Although paid sick leave and paid annual leave are frequently regulated through labour law and collective agreements, they are nevertheless included under this dimension. This is also justified by the fact that there might be a trade-off between direct wages and salaries and non-wage pecuniary benefits, e.g., in countries in which employees can choose an increased salary in lieu of entitlements to paid leave. The indicators currently measure both the entitlement of leave and the leave actually taken.

Indicators in sub-dimension 2b Non-wage pecuniary benefits

2b1	Paid leave entitlement	Percentage of employees entitled to paid annual leave
2b2	Days of paid leave entitlement	Mean number of days of paid annual leave per year to which employees are entitled
2b3	Actual days of paid leave	Mean number of days of paid annual leave used per employee during the reference year
2b4	Sick leave entitlement	Percentage of employees entitled to paid

[21] *Resolution concerning an integrated system of wages statistics*, adopted by the Twelfth ICLS in 1973 available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/standards-and-guidelines/resolutions-adopted-by-international-conferences-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_087496/lang--en/index.htm

		sick leave
2b5	Days of sick leave entitlement	Mean number of days of paid sick leave per year to which employees are entitled
2b6	Actual days of sick leave	Mean number of days of paid sick leave used per employee during the reference year

C. Dimension 3: Working time and work-life balance

52. Dimension 3 of the statistical framework on measuring quality of employment covers various aspects of working time and work-life balance. Working time refers to the time associated with productive activities and the arrangement of this time during a specified reference period. Work-life balance in this framework encompasses not only measures that would be expected to be closely related to decisions to work for pay or profit given family or care responsibilities, but does also attempt to measure time allocation between time spent in a job(s) and time spent in private life.

1. Sub-dimension 3a: Working hours

53. The sub-dimension of *working hours* focuses on the number of working hours. The concept of working hours in the context of the statistical framework on measuring quality of employment is the hours usually worked and not the hours actually worked in a reference week, both of which are defined in the 18th ICLS Resolution on Working Time. Incidental fluctuations in working hours, e.g., due to paid leave or illness, are usually of little relevance for quality of employment. Since the framework takes the perspective of the individual worker, in addition to the number of hours worked in the main job, the total number of hours in all jobs held by the same person should also be measured, if available. It is of particular importance to include information on secondary jobs in countries in which secondary jobs are held by a substantial number of employed persons.

Indicators in sub-dimension 3a Working hours

3a1	Mean weekly working hours	Mean weekly hours usually worked per employed person
3a2	Long working hours	Percentage of employed persons usually working 49 hours or more per week
3a3	Involuntary part-time work	Percentage of employed persons working part time for the main reason that they did not find a full-time job
3a4	Distribution of weekly working hours	Employment by weekly hours usually worked (hours in standardised hour bands)
3a5	Multiple job holders	Percentage of employed persons who have more than one job

2. Sub-dimension 3b: Working time arrangements

54. Working at atypical hours, when practiced over a long period of time, may adversely affect worker's health. This suggests that *working time arrangements* are

relevant to the quality of employment. For this reason, the topic is included as a separate sub-dimension. The sub-dimension includes information regarding the share of employed persons working in the evening, at night or on the weekend. Many studies indicate that there is a (negative) relationship between working outside usual working hours (in particular at night, but also during the weekend or in the evening) and well-being. The sub-dimension furthermore covers the use of a flexible work schedule. Although not always having straightforward implications on quality of employment, the flexibility to schedule working time may have a major impact on workers' well-being, too.

Indicators in sub-dimension 3b Working time arrangements		
3b1	Night work	Percentage of employed persons who usually work at night
3b2	Evening work	Percentage of employed persons who usually work in the evening
3b3	Weekend work	Percentage of employed persons who usually work on the weekend
3b4	Flexible work schedules	Percentage of employees with a flexible work schedule

3. Sub-dimension 3c: Work-life balance

55. The sub-dimension *Work-life balance* seeks to highlight elements of work that potentially conflict with other aspects of life or facilitate reconciling work with private life. The balance between work and family life often is difficult for parents with young children. The access of employed persons to child care, as well as the possibility to work at home, may facilitate or impede reconciling work for pay or profit with household duties, child care and leisure activities. Furthermore, the mean duration of commuting from home to work can have a significant impact on work-life balance. The issue of parental leave is a particularly challenging element of this sub-dimension. Such types of leave differ greatly between countries and not all persons in parental leave are considered employed in national Labour Force Surveys. These issues need further development and analysis work in order to gradually improve the indicators.

Indicators in sub-dimension 3c Work-life balance		
3c1	Employment rate of mothers and fathers	Percentage of women, respectively men aged 20-49 years who are employed with and without children under compulsory school age
3c2	Possibility to work at home	Percentage of employed persons whose working arrangements offer the possibility to work at home
3c3	Commuting time	Mean duration of commuting time between work and home (one way)
3c4	Care leave entitlement	Percentage of employed persons entitled to leave for care responsibilities for children or adults

3c5	Parental leave	Percentage of parents in employment on parental leave
3cx	Child care use (experimental)	Percentage of employed parents with children under compulsory school age who currently use child care

D. Dimension 4: Security of employment and social protection

56. The dimension of Security of employment and social protection assesses the threats to employment security as well as the measures and safety nets that can offset possible risks that come with short or long spells of unemployment or being outside the labour force, health problems and retirement. The feeling of insecurity will often adversely affect well-being, as a number of empirical studies have shown.[22]

1. Sub-dimension 4a: Security of employment

57. The sub-dimension *Security of employment* essentially refers to how likely a person is to lose his or her job(s). It involves information on the degree of permanence and tenure of the work, the status in employment and the formal or informal nature of employment. Information on the perceived job security is an important element to complement information available on rather objective indicators regarding security of employment, e.g., the percentage of fixed-term contracts or of persons employed via temporary employment agencies. As demonstrated by recent research, security of employment is a very important dimension for quality of employment. For example, out of all the dimensions, job security and job prospects (as well as work motivation) have the largest impact on the well-being of the worker.[23]

58. Two indicators are still earmarked as experimental: the precarious employment rate and the informal employment rate. While the work of the Expert Group has shown that such indicators can be powerful tools of analysis, it was at the same time acknowledged that further conceptual and methodological developments are needed in order to make the indicators fully operational, in particular in developed countries.

Indicators in sub-dimension 4a Security of employment		
4a1	Fixed-term contracts	Percentage of employed persons 25 years and older with fixed term contract
4a2	Job tenure	Percentage of employed persons aged 25 years or over whose number of years of tenure at the current job or with the current employer is (1) < 1 year, (2) 1 – less than 5 years (3) 5 – less than 10

[22] For a recent overview, see Green, Francis, 2006: *Demanding work. The paradox of job quality in affluent economy*. Princeton and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 126-149.
[23] See Eurofound, 2013: *Health and well-being at work. A report based on the fifth European Working Conditions Survey*. Dublin. Eurofound.

		years and (4) >= 10 years
4a3	Own account workers	Percentage of employed persons who are own-account workers
4a4	Self-employed with one client	Percentage of self-employed workers with only one client
4a5	Perceived job security	Percentage of employed persons who might lose their job in the next six months
4a6	Temporary employment agency workers	Percentage of employed persons employed via a temporary employment agency
4a7	Lack of formal contract	Percentage of employed persons without formal contracts or without pay slip / pay stub
4ax1	Precarious employment rate (experimental)	Percentage of employed persons who are in precarious employment (as defined in ICSE-93)
4ax2	Informal employment rate (experimental)	Percentage of employed persons in informal employment

2. Sub-dimension 4b: Social protection

59. *Social protection* may be available in a variety of forms including unemployment insurance, pensions, and health insurance. The components of social protection covered here are distinct from those in Income and benefits from employment, as the former are more directly linked with the security of employment (e.g., likelihood of pregnant women losing employment) and often the cost of these benefits is not solely borne by the employer.

Indicators in sub-dimension 4b Social protection		
4b1	Pension insurance coverage	Percentage of employed persons who are active contributors to a pension scheme
4b2	Unemployment insurance coverage	Percentage of employees that are active contributors to an unemployment insurance scheme
4b3	Medical insurance coverage	Percentage of employed persons who are active contributors to a medical insurance plan/scheme related to their employment

E. Dimension 5: Social dialogue

60. The degree to which workers are able to join organisations of their own choosing and on a collective basis enter into social dialogue with employers (and their organisations) and the government is an important aspect of quality of employment that facilitates the improvement of employment conditions covered in the other dimensions of the statistical framework. Effective social dialogue is a prerequisite for healthy employment relationships which in turn contribute to other dimensions of employment quality. Social dialogue includes all types of negotiation, consultation or simply exchange of information between representatives of

governments, employers and workers on issues of common interest relating to economic and social policy.

Indicators in dimension 5: Social dialogue		
5.1	Collective bargaining coverage rate	Percentage of employees covered by collective bargaining agreements
5.2	Trade union density rate	Percentage of employees who are members of one or more trade union
5.3	Days not worked due to strikes and lock-out	Days not worked due to strikes and lock-out per 1000 employees (or employed persons)
5.x	Employer organisation density rate (experimental)	Percentage of employees working in enterprises belonging to an employer's organisation

F. Dimension 6: Skills development and training

61. The fit between the skills of the worker and the demands of the job as well as the opportunity to further develop the skills of the worker both play an important role for quality of employment. It has been argued that, while there is a long-term trend to rising average levels of workers' skills one can observe a trend towards skill polarisation. Workers with a lower skill level would have increasing problems in finding employment opportunities and at the same time have to make concessions regarding their salary, employment security as well as working conditions.[24] Empirical research shows a strong correlation of employability and well-being.[25] However, not only low skill levels often go along with lower levels of quality of employment: If the worker is not able to use the acquired skills in his or her job, this might lead to reduced well-being and dissatisfaction.

Indicators in dimension 6: Skills development and training		
6.1	Training participation	Percentage of employed persons having received job-related non-formal education and training in the past twelve months
6.2	Volume of training	Volume of job-related non-formal education and training per participant in the last twelve months (in days)
6.3	Usefulness of training	Percentage of employed persons whose job-related non-formal education and training has helped improve the way they work

[24] Green, F., 2006: *Demanding work. The paradox of job quality in the affluent economy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 24-43. Gallie, D., 1991: *Patterns of Skill Change: Upskilling, Deskilling or the Polarization of Skills?* In: Work, Employment & Society 5, pp. 319-351. Gallie, D. et al., 1998: *Restructuring the Employment Relationship.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[25] See, e.g., Eurofound, 2013: *Health and well-being at work. A report based on the fifth European Working Conditions Survey.* Dublin: Eurofound.

6.4	Learning at work	Percentage of employed persons whose job involves improving their skills
6.5	Employability	Percentage of employed persons whose work experience and job skills would be helpful to find another job
6.6	Skills match	Percentage of employed persons who have the opportunity to use their knowledge and skills in their current job

G. Dimension 7: Employment-related relationships and work motivation

62. Employment-related relationships and work motivation characteristics are important elements of quality of employment. Empirical research has shown that they directly affect the well-being of the individual employed person, often the impact is even bigger compared to traditional indicators of quality of employment.[26] Employment-related relationships and work motivation are important for several reasons. From the point of view of the individual worker, they not only directly affect health and well-being, but are also key factors for achieving high levels of sustainability of work. Workers who have sufficient job autonomy, can influence organisational decisions, and are not subject to excessive work intensity, will show higher levels of motivation and engagement and be less likely to leave the labour market prematurely. The social support from co-workers and superiors also has a huge impact on the well-being of the workers and is at the same time an important factor to cope with difficult work situations. Two sub-dimensions are distinguished: employment-related relationships and work motivation. The first relates to the social characteristics of the work, for instance the social support from co-workers and superiors as well as the exposure to adverse social behaviour. The second sub-dimension comprises the more individual motivational characteristics.[27]

1. Sub-dimension 7a: Employment-related relationships

63. The sub-dimension on *employment-related relationships* focuses on inter-employee dialogue and relationships, as well as communication between employees and their supervisors. Research on social support has suggested that low social support and social isolation are associated with increased health risks, both regarding the support of co-workers and of superiors.[28] The relationship with co-workers is measured through an indicator asking whether employed persons have a good relationship with their co-workers and colleagues. A similar indicator is being used to measure the relationship with the supervisor.[29] A further aspect is the exposure to socially adverse behaviour in relation with employment. The indicator

[26] Lowe, G. and G. Shellenberg, 2001: *What's a Good Job? The Importance of Employment Relationships*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Study No. W05, Ottawa, 2001.

[27] See for example: Humphrey, S., J. Nahrgang and F. Morgeson, 2007: *Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, pp. 1332–1356.

[28] For an overview, see Eurofound, 2013: *Health and well-being at work. A report based on the fifth European Working Conditions Survey*. Dublin: Eurofound, pp. 26-27.

[29] In contrast, whether regular feedback is received from the supervisor is rather seen as an indicator for work motivation and therefore included in sub-dimension 7b.

selected for the statistical framework focuses on unequivocal cases of adverse behaviour, i.e. employment-related physical, psychological or sexual violence.

Indicators in sub-dimension 7a: Employment-related relationships		
7a1	Relationship with co-workers	Percentage of employed persons who have a good relationship with their co-workers and colleagues
7a2	Relationship with supervisor	Percentage of employees who have a good relationship with their supervisor
7a3	Employment-related violence	Percentage of persons who have been victim of physical, psychological or sexual violence in relation with their employment in the last 12 months

2. Sub-dimension 7b: Work motivation

64. The dimension of *work motivation* is key to understanding the factors that drive employed persons in carrying out their work. According to the standard theories of work motivation, characteristics determining work motivation include the degree to which the employee has independence, freedom and discretion in carrying out the job (job autonomy), the degree to which workers receive regular feedback from their supervisor, the degree to which the work carried out is being perceived as having valuable goals and being useful to other people (intrinsic rewards), the degree to which the job has to be provided under time (or other kinds of) pressure (work intensity), as well as the degree to which employed persons are given the opportunity to influence organisational decisions regarding their work.[30]

Indicators in sub-dimension 7b: Work motivation		
7b1	Job autonomy	Percentage of employed persons who are able to choose their methods of work or to influence their pace of work
7b2	Feedback from supervisor	Percentage of employees who receive regular feedback from their supervisor
7b3	Intrinsic rewards	Percentage of employed persons who do "useful" work
7b4	Work intensity	Percentage of employed persons who have to work at very high speed or to tight deadlines
7b5	Organisational participation	Percentage of employed persons who can influence decisions that affect their work

[30] See Hackman, J. and G. Oldham, 1975: *Development of job diagnostic survey*. In: Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, pp. 159-170; Karasek, R., 1979: *Job demands, job decision latitude and mental strain: implications for job redesign*. In: Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, pp. 285–308; Siegrist, J., 1996: *Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions*. In: Journal of Occupational Health and Psychology, 1, pp. 27–41.

VI. Future work and research issues

65. To keep the framework relevant in light of labour market changes, the need to adapt the framework should be examined at regular intervals. New data sources might become available, enabling the compilation of new indicators.

66. Research areas identified by the Expert Group so far include the following:

(a) Development of further specific indicators on discrimination at work (sub-dimension 1c);

(b) Development of indicators regarding the prospects for promotion, including the use of longitudinal indicators of mobility within and across employers (dimensions 2 and 6);

(c) Further refinement of the indicators regarding work-life balance, in particular those regarding the implications and measurement of parental leave and the use of child care (sub-dimension 3c);

(d) Requirements for an implementation of the concept of "precarious employment" from the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-93) (dimension 4);

(e) Analysis and development of operational definitions allowing to measure the impact of subcontracting on security of employment (sub-dimension 4a);

(f) Application of informal employment according to the Guidelines concerning a statistical definition of informal employment endorsed by the 17th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) (dimension 4);

(g) Review of the indicators after the revision of the International Classification of Status of Employment (ICSE-93), scheduled for the 20th ICLS (in particular sub-dimension 4a);

(h) Coverage of the population by (basic) health care provision (dimension 4);

(i) Development of further indicators relating to social insurance covering further contingencies, in particular disability (dimension 4).

67. There is a need for continued exchange of experience and expertise at the international level in order to ensure the framework remains practical and relevant. Further research should be spent regarding the option of the construction of indices summarising several indicators. Statistical offices are invited to make use of the statistical framework for publications regarding quality of employment in their countries and to provide feedback regarding their experiences.

VII. How to use the indicators

68. Numerous rounds of exercises and revisions have been undertaken to confirm the current statistical framework and the indicators for measuring quality of employment. Country reports (15 at the time of the Sixth meeting of the Group of Experts on Measuring Quality of Employment) proved the practicability of the dimensions and the indicators. This is not to say that the list of indicators cannot be modified as long as the changes are well-justified. It is acknowledged that the list is dynamic and will require adaptations to changing circumstances in the future.

69. In applying the indicators, it is proposed that countries consider all aspects of quality of employment indicators and decide for themselves which indicators are the most relevant. The Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment has prepared detailed indicator sheets. These contain sections on measurement objectives, formula, recommended data sources, recommended metadata, recommended disaggregation, guidelines for interpretation and comparisons as well as suggested readings.

70. At the national level, the indicators can be also used to identify labour market trends. In cases of economic downturn, for example, it is useful to know how the labour market adapts not only in terms of changes in the quantity of work but also through changes in the quality of work. Secondly, the indicators are especially useful to identify groups with less favourable labour market situations. Many different sub-populations could be considered in this context: sex, age categories, ethnic minorities, level of educational attainment, persons with a disability, regions, etc. This requires that the indicators are measured for the categories in question, allowing a breakdown for the quantitative indicators. Finally, the list of indicators may be used to compare the quality of employment in different sectors of economic activity or in different occupational groups.

71. It is recommended that countries decide according to national circumstances in which periodicity they deem it necessary to provide indicators on quality of employment. For many indicators annual reporting would probably be the standard. For indicators that are known to change slowly over time, a multi-annual periodicity might also be sufficient.

72. Another important comparison between different categories of employed persons, at least for certain dimensions of quality of employment, is that of status in employment: employees; employers, own-account workers; and contributing family workers. They may face different issues with respect to issues of quality of employment. The quality of employment indicators aim at covering both persons in paid employment and the self-employed, and for that reason, many of the indicators are defined in terms of all employed persons. While some sub-dimensions are by definition more relevant for employees, countries should in principle cover all employed persons when measuring quality of employment.

73. Finally, it is recognised that change over time, up or down, in some indicators could have a different meaning in different contexts. For example, an increase in the numbers of hours worked per employee for a given economic activity may mean a reduction in the quality of employment in a country where policy-makers view that employees are overworked, compared to another country where there may be a general lack of employment opportunities. The users of the indicator should decide for themselves whether or not quality of employment is improving. Again, as suggested earlier, that assessment should be done using the maximum number of relevant variables available for an individual country.

74. Although the interpretation might be challenging when making international comparisons, countries are encouraged to make use of the indicators also from a comparative perspective. As most indicators are available form internationally harmonised sources, international comparisons should be feasible at least for groups of countries. To further facilitate international comparability, it is recommended to make use of international standard classifications, including the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08), the International Standard Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-93), the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED 2011), and the International Standard Classification of International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic

Activities (ISIC rev. 4). Whenever data are available, the most recent versions of these classifications should be used. Nevertheless, it is recommended to take into account the national circumstances in all of the countries when making comparisons.

United Nations ECE/CES/2015/4/Add.1

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
5 June 2015

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-third plenary session
Geneva, 15–17 June 2015
Item 5 (d) of the provisional agenda
Statistical Framework for Measuring Quality of Employment

Results of the consultation on the draft Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment, a Statistical Framework

Note by the Secretariat

Summary

The note summarises the comments made by members of the Conference of European Statisticians on the draft *Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment, A Statistical Framework* which is an updated edition of the Framework adopted by the Conference in 2010.

The secretariat carried out the electronic consultation in December 2014. A total of 38 countries and international organisations replied. There was a high level of support for the endorsement of this updated edition of the Framework. A number of comments and suggestions were received, which are addressed in this note and incorporated in the final version of the Framework (ECE/CES/2015/4/Add.2) available at: www.unece.org/index.php?id=38920#/

In view of the support received, the Conference of European Statisticians will be invited to endorse the *Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment, A Statistical Framework*.

GE.15-09088 (E)

1509088

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. This note summarises the comments on the draft *Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment, A Statistical Framework*, resulting from the electronic consultation conducted in December 2014.

2. In February 2012, the CES Bureau established an Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment (EGMQE) with the following objectives:

- Revise the structure for measuring quality of employment as outlined in the Report on Potential Indicators for Measurement of Quality of Employment endorsed by the CES plenary session in June 2010. The report is available from this website: http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=14183
- Revise the set of indicators of quality of employment in order to reflect issues that were raised at the CES plenary session in 2010 and in country reports.
- Develop indicator sheets with operational definitions and guidelines for the practical compilation of quality of employment indicators.

3. The statistical framework (presented in document ECE/CES/2015/4/Add.2) includes a revised structure for measuring quality of employment, together with explanatory text for the different dimensions of quality of employment, a revised set of proposed indicators and detailed indicator sheets for the proposed indicators. The indicator sheets have been reviewed for clarity and consistency and updated to reflect current international standards and recommendations.

4. In October 2014, the CES Bureau reviewed the draft *Handbook* and requested the UNECE secretariat to send the document to all CES members for electronic consultation.

5. A total of 38 replies were received in response to the request for comments on the draft Handbook – from 36 countries and 2 organisations. The following countries and organisations replied: Albania, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, the Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Eurostat and OECD.

II. General comments

6. The responding countries and organizations supported endorsement of the *Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment, A Statistical Framework*. No country or international organisation objected to endorsement. A number of countries and organisations submitted specific comments, many of which were suggestions for the improvement of the draft Framework.

7. The comments received on the topics for future research are presented in Annex 1, as well as the responses from the Expert Group. Annex 2 outlines specific comments made by countries and organisations. The final draft reflecting all comments received (ECE/CES/2015/4/Add.2) is available at: www.unece.org/index.php?id=38920#/

8. There were many favourable comments about the usefulness of the framework for measuring quality of employment, and many countries commended the Expert Group on the quality and usefulness of its work. A number of general comments are briefly presented below:

(a) Albania: Stated that the overall structure of the framework is very informative, clear and coherent;

(b) Australia: Stated that the framework is comprehensive and covers relevant aspects of quality of employment from an individual's perspective. Remarked that structuring the framework into a number of dimensions and sub-dimensions, and then indicators within these, provides a comprehensive and clear articulation of the topic. Also noted that having a number of indicators in each dimension, both objective and subjective, allows the flexibility for countries to choose which indicators are most appropriate for national reporting as required. While there is some commonality with other indicator sets that have been developed, this set has the advantage that it is not driven by a particular policy initiative, therefore should ensure longevity in its relevance;

(c) Azerbaijan: Commented that the framework was prepared at the highest professional level and expressed appreciation for the work of Expert Group;

(d) Colombia: Stated that the framework is generally well-structured and provides clear and well-argued guidance;

(e) Georgia: Remarked that the framework and its set of indicators will assist countries with monitoring and developing their policies to improve quality of employment. Noted the importance of the Statistical Framework as a statistical toolbox that can be used in various contexts and does not suite a particular purpose or policy agenda. Commented that the detailed indicator sheets will provide useful practical guidance to National Statistical Offices in compiling statistics on measuring quality of employment;

(f) Germany: Remarked that quality of employment is a highly relevant topic and the statistical framework is of great use to foster the production of statistics measuring all relevant aspects. Will apply the framework in their own publications and are ready to contribute to further developments;

(g) Hungary: Stated that measuring quality of employment is a very important topic and that the seven dimensions highlight the most important issues relating to the emerging forms of employment and newer working time patterns. Commented that the main advantage of the draft is laying out a complex framework for all important known issues, while also paying attention to the future research work required by the constantly changing working life. Highlighted the usefulness of the sections in the indicator sheets on interpretation guidelines, international comparisons, formulas for calculation and suggested further reading, as well as the reminder to analyse indicators jointly to avoid misinterpretation;

(h) Portugal: Welcomed the initiative and the good work of the Expert Group and remarked that the framework is an excellent and useful working tool for the implementation and interpretation of the indicators considered;

(i) Russian Federation: Stated that the framework provides comprehensive criteria for measuring quality of employment and developing statistical information on individual indicators, taking into account the features of national labour laws;

(j) Slovakia: Especially appreciated that the framework reflects that not all data sources are available in all countries. Remarked that recommended data sources (in the indicator sheets) provide more detailed insight about the options available for data collection;

(k) Spain: Generally agreed with the idea of stability of the current 2014 document, considering it desirable to maintain unchanged, as far as possible, the conceptual framework (dimensions and sub-dimensions);

(l) Sweden: Agreed with the report's basic approach concerning the underlying concepts, coverage and relevance of statistics at a national level. Found that the seven dimensions in the report are reasonable. Remarked that the structure and content of the report have been improved compared with the 2010 version. Commented that Sweden already produces some statistics in the seven dimensions mentioned in the report, but there is no direct plan to produce a comprehensive set of "statistics on quality of employment".

III. Conclusion

9. All countries and organisations that responded supported the endorsement of the Framework.

10. The Expert Group on Measuring Quality of Employment reviewed carefully all comments received from countries and organisations. A number of corrections and updates to country specific information included in examples and annexes have been incorporated. In addition, all editorial comments were taken on board. To the extent possible, all comments were incorporated in the final version submitted to the 2015 CES plenary session for endorsement.

11. In view of the support by countries and organisations, it is proposed that the Conference of European Statisticians endorses the *Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment, A Statistical Framework.*

Annex 1

List of topics for future research and development

1. Annex 1 presents the comments received on the topics for future research and development in the framework:

(a) Australia: The upcoming review of the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE) will be an important consideration in relation to future work, particularly for the concepts of precarious employment and contracting arrangements;

(b) Canada: The future research and development section is considered a "living" section, meaning that it will never be truly complete. We have no additional suggestions at this time, but reserve the right to submit suggestions at a later date;

(c) Denmark: The framework would gain from further exploration of the contextual information. That is, more specific suggested contextual information should follow each indicator;

(d) Hungary: The most important trends and issues are covered. To be sure, new questions will arise, requiring further research. Although we agree with the indicated topics for future research, this list of topics cannot be considered complete in the changing world of work;

(e) Lithuania: In addition to the topics already mentioned, there could be an additional area dedicated to a broader view of the labour market (e.g. unemployment level, registered unemployment level, and their ratio, in order to see whether the unemployed in a country tend to choose the help from the state or prefer to search for jobs themselves). Also, in order to assess the influence of unemployment benefits, the ratio of unemployment benefits to wages might be considered;

(f) Mexico: A future research area is to have a better understanding of grey zones in status in employment between paid dependent workers and independent workers, who tend to work under contract arrangements of supplying of services rather than labour contracts. If the revision of ICSE defines these atypical modalities better, these cases should be detected, especially when an employed person has changed from a regular salary status to an atypical status: from the realm of the labour law to the mercantile one;

(g) Portugal: It seems important to consider, in the near future, the possibility of including an indicator to assess satisfaction with work in general terms, allowing a broader notion of quality of employment, regardless of the characterisation of that work in each of the proposed dimensions. The main objective would be to analyse the various ways in which individuals evaluate their job. Other possible dimensions that might contribute to a more complete picture of the subject in question concern: the degree of social responsibility of companies/organisations in the implementation of internal measures that promote the employees quality of life, such as the creation of infrastructure (for example: canteen, medical centre, kindergarten, car park, etc.), the promotion of extra-work activities (sports, cultural activities, etc.), the offer of health insurance, productivity bonuses, old pensions supplements, among others. The working conditions related to the equipment, use of information technology, physical space, procedures and other labour standards that boost employees' performance;

(h) Turkey: A future attempt may be to estimate an index for employment quality such as "job quality index (JQI)" developed by European Trade Union Institution for the EU27 Countries, using the headline indicators;

(i) United States: The promotional potential for specific jobs, measures of occupational and job mobility within and across employers should be considered. Measures of individual and household earnings and income stability across time (do those who are currently employed in the lower proportion of the earnings distribution remain there across time and vice versa) should also be included. Social protection measures should be expanded to include disability insurance and privately provided (employer based) pension plans (the vast majority of workers in the U.S. are covered by Social Security- the government provided pension plan). Work Balance measures should include whether individuals on parental or other long term leave have the right to return to the same job or job type or are just guaranteed employment at their previous employer. Work-life balance indicators should also include measures of those who are facing work-life balance issues due to eldercare, care for older dependent children who reside in their parents' homes or care for other relatives (besides children) and friends.

Response from the Expert Group

2. Additional topics for future work have been added to paragraph 108 and 109 of the framework document.

Annex 2

Specific comments

1. Annex 2 outlines additional comments made by countries and organisations about the Framework:

(a) Albania: Many indicators under each dimension are collected mainly through the Labour Force Survey (LFS). Therefore it is suggested to stress the need to develop new ad-hoc modules (apart from those supported by Eurostat) that might be integrated in the LFS questionnaire. This is necessary to ensure the sustainability of data collection. On page 74, in the recommended data sources for the Hazardous child labour (1b2) indicator, population census is mentioned as a source. A census might be used to create the frame for child labour surveys, but the census objective cannot be the measurement of child labour. Under dimension 7, "Employment-related relationships and work motivation", it is suggested to add another indicator that measures employment engagement;

Response from the Expert Group

2. Recommending any additional data collection is a very sensitive topic. Data sources are suggested for nearly all indicators. The decision whether additional collection is deemed necessary is entirely up to the countries. Population census has been removed from the recommended data sources in indicator sheet 1b2. Employment engagement has been added as a topic for future work in paragraph 108.

(b) Australia: It is good that quality of employment is explicitly taken from the individual's perspective, while recognising that the measures may be at the macro, meso or micro level. The framework recognises that Quality of Employment is multi-dimensional and that the dimensions are inter-related. It also recognises that the context (legislative, social and economic) is an important consideration when interpreting the indicators. The ABS has recently reduced its focus on regularly reporting on the progress of Australia, where a number of these Indicators featured within the Measures of Australia's Progress (MAP) framework. However, should there be increased demand for the ABS to reinstate MAP, the Quality of Employment framework provides a suitable set of indicators to draw on in relation to the 'Quality Jobs' dimension. Further, the ABS plans to reference the Quality of Employment framework in the refresh of 'Frameworks for Australian Social Statistics' within the 'Work' dimension;

(c) Belarus: The proposed *Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment. A Statistical Framework* does not contain a clear definition of the quality of employment. We agree that quality of employment is a complex and multidimensional concept, and the task of statistics is to provide the full set of indicators, on the basis of which it would be possible to analyse the quality of employment. At the same time, it would be appropriate to have a clear delineation for defining quality of employment;

Response from the Expert Group

3. The definition of quality of employment was further specified in paragraph 16.

(d) Colombia: How are the definition of decent work and quality of employment distinguishable? Considering that the quality of work depends on the "perspective taken", the question is: do we seek international comparability and alignment of indicators? Was a synthetic multidimensional indicator of quality of employment considered? We recommend widening the scope of the section on the concept of quality of employment to indicate that indicators are intended to be internationally comparable. In sub-dimension 1a, it is

important to measure not only the nonfatal occupational injuries, but also the intensity of them. In sub-dimension 1b, the other worst forms of child labor are an interesting and very important measure, but quite hidden and difficult to measure by national statistical institutions. It should be considered whether it should be included as a key indicator given this restriction. In sub-dimension 3c, the care of children in developing countries is complicated to measure correctly, due to the lack of an objective definition of the use of child care. In sub-dimension 4a, the indicators of labour informality still are not agreed upon and measures can be quite heterogeneous. We believe that this should be considered in the document. In sub-dimension 7b, we recommend that the definition of "regularly" in indicator 7b2 should be expanded;

Response from the Expert Group

4. Through the active participation of the ILO in the Expert Group, it has been made sure that the framework is consistent with the Decent Work indicators to the largest extent possible. Still, one of the main differences in approaches is that the statistical framework has been developed as a statistical toolbox that can be used in various contexts and is not linked to a particular policy agenda. As explained in paragraph 31, the use of international standards and recommendations is one of basic principles of the development of the statistical framework. Paragraph 116 further specifies the issue of international comparability and the indicator sheets include detailed remarks about the international comparability of each of the indicators. An overall composite indicator was discussed but ultimately decided against, as it would be controversial and difficult to construct objectively. However, paragraph 109 identifies the development of dashboards, aggregated indicators and the identification of core indicators as a topic for continued exchange of experiences and expertise. Intensity of nonfatal occupational injuries is covered in the recommended disaggregation section of the indicator sheet (e.g., type of injury, number of lost workdays). The difficulty of measuring other worst forms of child labour, child care use and informal employment is reflected by their status as experimental indicators.

(e) Czech Republic: At the fourth common UNECE/EUROSTAT/ILO seminar that was held in April 2007 in Geneva, one of the dimensions discussed was "Employment opportunities". This is an important dimension, including such indicators as, e.g., employment rate, labour force participation rate, unemployment rate, inactivity rate, youth unemployment rate etc. It has been completely omitted in the newly presented document. Similarly, some of the indicators relating to a person's income (e.g. average earnings in selected occupations or share of the working poor in the employed population) has not been further mentioned in the document, despite the fact that, e.g., the percentage of working poor has been increasing recently. These indicators are important for the evaluation of the overall situation in the labour market and it is recommended to include them again in the list. On the other hand, we are sceptical of the use and benefit of some proposed indicators, which are rather of a subjective or personal character. These are, e.g., percentage of employed persons who are exposed to mental well-being risk factors at work, percentage of employed who have been a victim of discrimination at work and percentage of employed persons in informal employment. The last mentioned indicator is hardly ascertainable. Last but not least, one must be aware of additional costs on those surveys (directed to obtaining mentioned information) that are not included into the standard household surveys. It is recommended to re-evaluate the document keeping in mind the above stated remarks;

Response from the Expert Group

5. The importance and role of context information has been clarified in paragraph 38. Breakdown by occupation is recommended in indicator sheet 2a1. Share of working poor has been mentioned as a context indicator in paragraph 65. Further clarifications have been

added about the subjectivity of some indicators and the limitations of discrimination measures.

(f) Eurostat: The definition of quality of employment adequately addresses the multidimensionality of the concept. It is also pertinent to choose the workers perspective comprising objective and subjective indicators;

(g) Georgia: The statistical framework and its set of indicators will assist countries with monitoring and developing their policies to improve quality of employment The detailed indicator sheets will provide useful practical guidance to National Statistical Offices, but as the statistical framework follows the definitions of employment endorsed by the Resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilisation adopted by the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) held in October 2013, to further international comparability, it is necessary for countries first of all to adopt the resolution and then expand the collection of statistics on quality of employment where desirable;

(h) Hungary: We agree with the definitions of concepts concerning the quality of employment. However, the operationalization of some indicators in data collection requires further methodological research;

(i) Mexico: With regard to the definition of quality of employment, even though all elements are there, the definition is rather loose in section II. Paragraph 16 is an example. Again, all elements are there but do not tighten up. It is more enumerative than conceptual. It is suggested that where it says: "In other words, quality of employment refers to the conditions, ethics…. And work-life balance of an individual" to add: making worth to be employed beyond a mere survival necessity because that condition provides also a sense of security, social goods and self-respect. The definition should be able to answer the plain question: in short; what is quality of employment?

Response from the Expert Group

6. The definition of quality of employment was further specified in paragraph 16.

(j) OECD: The definition of quality of employment is well suited to the purpose of the framework (i.e. that it is a statistical tool and has no specific link to a policy agenda);

(k) Poland: We generally agree with the definition of quality of employment. However there are few issues that should be addressed: 1) It is not explained if there are any specific reasons to adopt the individual's perspective. 2) The list of indicators also includes regular labour market indicators (such as average earnings, employment level). 3) How to read quality of employment indicators – what is high, what is low quality of employment? How should indicators such as average earnings be interpreted? What about changes in time or differences between groups? In addition, Indicator 5.3, Days not worked due to strikes and lock-out, adopts rather the employers' perspective, so it is worth revising the list of indicators in order to change this indicator;

Response from the Expert Group

7. The adoption of the individual's perspective is a purely analytical decision. The role of context information, including regular labour market indicators, has been clarified in paragraph 38. Paragraph 24 explains that judgments about "high" vs. "low" quality employment are left to the users of the data. The indicator sheets provided detailed explanations about how indicators should be interpreted. "Days not worked due to strikes" is an indirect measure of the effectiveness of social dialogue, which affects both employees and employers. Indicator sheet 5.3 has been updated to clarify that the aim is not to measure the impact on production.

(l) Turkey: Generally, the structure of the framework is clear and coherent except Dimension 7, "Work motivation". This section might be supported by additional indicators explaining dimensions more clearly (for example premiums, rewards, benefits and facilities based on performance). After receiving feedback from countries, this section could be reviewed. In this report, almost all aspects of quality of employment are covered, with over fifty recommended indicators and detailed definitions. Countries may choose the most appropriate indicators for their policy purposes. Taking into account the large number of indicators, it would be useful to reduce to a limited number of headline indicators that capture employment quality best and are suitable for international comparisons. In that context, an effort should be made to have countries reach a consensus on headline indicators. In Dimension 1 (c), "Fair treatment of employment", it is difficult to find the indicators of ethnic groups, immigrants, indigenous population and persons with disabilities since these data are difficult to derive from related sources. Dimensions such as sex, age groups and geographic regions, however, are available in our country;

Response from the Expert Group

8. The point about the work motivation section has been added to paragraph 104. The suggestion of headline indicators has been added as a topic for future work. Recommended breakdowns should not be removed simply because they are not available in all countries. Clarification has been added to paragraph 57 that it is the decision of each country to decide which breakdowns are relevant.

(m) The United Kingdom: In the header of each page in the Annex 2, dimension 3 section, the header has dimension 4 instead of dimension 3. There are occasions throughout the indicator sheets where words are written in both English and American form (e.g. organisations/organizations and customised/customized). Would be better to choose one or the other. A number of specific language corrections were also submitted;

Response from the Expert Group

9. The header has been fixed. An effort has been made to standardize English usage, although it should be noted that United Nations language guidelines use a mixture of English and American forms. The specific language changes proposed are reflected in the document.

(n) The United States: expressed interest in being involved in future work relating to quality of employment. The main points they raised are summarized below:

- It may be useful to concentrate on measures at the job level rather than the level of the employed person;
- The discrimination measures (e.g. pay gap) are descriptive statistics that do not necessarily reflect whether discrimination is present;
- Unionization rates do not necessarily correspond to levels of social dialogue;
- We do not agree with the statement in paragraph 3 that pertains to encouraging retirement;
- It is preferable to use the word earnings or wages instead of the word income, since income can include non-work income;
- In general, we do not implement subjective measures;
- Child labour rates should be generated by age groups;
- At least some earnings estimates should be presented on a real (as opposed to *nominal) basis;*

- It is unclear how the percentage of working mothers or fathers relates to work-life balance;
- The number of people covered by unemployment insurance is not cyclically sensitive;
- The low pay designation seems to be circular and always results in roughly the same proportion.

Response from the Expert Group

10. The Expert Group made a number of changes to the document to address these remarks. Responses to the above points are presented respectively below:

(a) Text has been added to paragraph 13 to clarify that countries can choose to focus on characteristics of the main job;

(b) Text has been added to both section IV of the framework and the pay gap indicator sheet to caution inferring that discrimination is necessarily present from these indicators;

(c) Text has been added to paragraph 96 to emphasize that low unionization rates do not necessarily imply a low level of social dialogue and vice versa;

(d) The statement in paragraph 3 has been removed;

(e) The terms "earnings" and "income from employment" are distinct and carefully defined in the document, but some additional clarification has been added;

(f) Additional text has been added to emphasize that the choice to implement subjective measures is left to the countries;

(g) Disaggregation by age group is already recommended in the child labour indicator sheet;

(h) Text has been added to indicator sheets 2a1, 2a3 and 2a4 about using nominally denominated earnings for purposes of comparison;

(i) Text has been added to indicator sheet 3c1 to elaborate on how the indicator relates to work-life balance;

(j) Unemployment insurance coverage can be somewhat cyclically sensitive (e.g. it can decrease in periods following a recession), but the text pertaining to this point has been softened;

(k) The low pay measure uses standard ILO and OECD definitions of low pay. The proportion is in fact quite different for different countries.

United Nations ECE/CES/2015/5

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
31 March 2015

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-third plenary session
Geneva, 15-17 June 2015
Item 7 (a) of the provisional agenda
Reports on the work of the Conference of European Statisticians, its Bureau and Teams of Specialists

Follow-up to the 2014 Conference of European Statisticians seminar on "What is the value of official statistics and how do we communicate that value?"

Note by the Office for National Statistics of the United Kingdom

Summary

This note provides information on the progress in follow-up to the decisions of the Conference of European Statisticians 2014 seminar on "What is the value of official statistics and how do we communicate that value?" The Bureau discussed the follow-up at its meetings in October 2014 and February 2015, and decided to establish a Task Force on the Value of Official Statistics. Work in some related areas is already ongoing under the Conference of European Statisticians, as explained further in the note.

The note is submitted to the Conference of European Statisticians for information. It was drafted in cooperation with Austria, Canada, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Eurostat, OECD and the UNECE Secretariat.

GE.15-06733 (E)

1506733

Please recycle

I. Background

1. In April 2014, the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) held a seminar on "What is the value of official statistics and how do we communicate that value?", and agreed on a number of follow-up actions:

(a) There is a lot of potential and interest to continue work related to the value of official statistics. There are things that the global statistical community can do together to make a paradigm shift from product to market orientation in communicating official statistics. The existing expert groups should be used for this purpose as much as possible;

(b) The UNECE High-level Group (HLG) for Modernization of Statistical Production and Services was asked to review possible actions to share best practices and develop common tools and solutions in this area;

(c) There is a need for developing a common language and terminology related to the value of official statistics and its communication;

(d) Measuring the economic value of official statistics through collection of examples and case studies would be useful.

2. In October 2014, the CES Bureau discussed follow-up to the recommended actions and agreed that a road-map should be developed to explore the key aspects to be covered in further work on communicating the value of official statistics. The Bureau members raised the following points about possible further work:

(a) The overall aim of this work would be to achieve a recognition of the value of official statistics by stakeholders;

(b) A common strategy, tools and marketing techniques for communicating the value of official statistics would be useful. These can include indicators to measure the value of official statistics, and a collection of case studies of calculating its economic value;

(c) Using an external evaluation and engaging people outside official statistics to promote its value may increase the credibility of these measures;

(d) There is a lack of comparable information on the cost of producing official statistics that could be used in the discussions on value of official statistics. Work on methods for calculating the cost of producing official statistics could be launched.

3. A group composed of the United Kingdom (chair), Austria, Canada, Mexico, OECD and UNECE prepared a concept note on the way forward which the CES Bureau discussed at its meeting in February 2015. The CES Bureau decided to establish a task force to develop ways to value the impact of official statistics, and asked the above mentioned countries and organisations to prepare terms of reference for the Task Force.

II. Why is this work needed?

4. International work on estimating and communicating the value of official statistics has become ever more important to:

- Work within budget constraints imposed on many national statistical offices;
- Clearly convey the reasons why investment in official statistics should be made;
- Defend the relevance of official statistics in the increasingly competitive information industry;

- Define in the presence of Data Revolution what is the business of Official Statistics;
- Pool together the good practices developed by statistical offices to enable learning from each other;
- Identify and develop better ways to explain official statistics to get people to understand their true value;

5. For effective communication, statisticians need to agree on;

- How to measure the value of official statistics.
- How to assess the overall impact of official statistics on the society.
- How to market/publicise official statistics and their value in a convincing manner.

6. Joint work would be helpful for advancing the measurement of the value and impact of official statistics which are difficult to define and quantify. It takes time before the impact of official statistics on the quality of government policy and the related effect on people can be observed. Work on estimating and communicating the value of official statistics should build on work already done to avoid duplication.

III. Related initiatives

A. Under the Conference of European Statisticians

7. A number of activities are carried out under the CES dealing with communicating the value of official statistics, namely:

(a) The HLG Modernisation Committee on Products and Sources has a work stream led by Richie McMahon (CSO Ireland), dealing with communicating and marketing the value of official statistics. The group updated a paper[1] originally drafted for the CES seminar on the value of official statistics in April 2014. The paper reflects on the unique values of official statistics and the weaknesses, describes some national practices, and discusses branding of official statistics. The paper also proposed a wider survey of national statistical offices to gather information about marketing the value of official statistics. An explorative survey of National Statistical Offices on outreach, communication, promotion and marketing activities was conducted in the first quarter of 2015. The survey will be followed-up by a more targeted survey where further information is collected on specific projects/activities. This will be coordinated between the HLG Modernisation Committee and the Work Session on Communication of Statistics. These surveys will be helpful in gathering good practices in communicating and marketing the value of official statistics. The goal is to establish an inventory of current and planned projects to foster exchange of experience;

(b) The regular Work Sessions on Communication of Statistics, currently chaired by Michael Levi (US Bureau of Labor Statistics), bring together communication experts to share ideas and experience. An expert meeting to be held in Washington, in April 2015, will discuss for one day the topic of "Building and Maintaining the Credibility of Official Statistics" to demonstrate the value of statistics to respondents. The same expert group has

[1] www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.45/2014/papers/Corien_Brouwer.pdf

discussed other topics related to communicating the value of official statistics, such as improving statistical literacy and building credibility[2];

(c) A new cross-cutting Task-Team on Communicating Statistical Modernisation was created in the context of the UNECE HLG for the Modernisation of Statistical Production and Services, and started work in February 2015. This group focuses solely on improving the communication of modernisation initiatives within statistical organisations and the official statistical community. This Task-Team might provide a useful "sounding board" for any new initiatives relating to communication;

(d) Some countries are using the Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM) as a tool to estimate the cost of official statistics. The current leaders in this respect include Estonia and Ireland. One advantage of this approach is increased international comparability of cost break-downs. An extension to the GSBPM to cover the non-data activities of statistical organisations is also being developed. These non-data activities should also be included when estimating the costs of official statistics. The new Generic Activity Model for Statistical Organisations[3] (GAMSO) will help in this respect.

B. Other related experience among the group members[4]

8. Countries have developed good practices in communicating the value of official statistics. International organizations have also worked in this area, e.g. on estimating the costs of producing official statistics and the related response burden. Currently, there is little information on countries' experience and how effective their initiatives have been.

9. The OECD Value for Money project tried to make a systematic assessment of the organization's costs (or inputs) and (the impact of) its outputs. To measure the output and its impact in monetary terms proved to be very complicated, if not impossible. In the end, it was decided to develop a systematic list of indicators based on directly observable measures for the output of the OECD, and to gather and further develop case studies quantifying the economic effect of OECD outputs.

10. Austria communicates the value of official statistics to the media with concrete examples relating to its outputs. For example, Statistics Austria introduced a register-based methodology for the population and housing census. As a result, this census round was much less costly than the previous one. The cost savings were communicated to the media with a very good response. Another example that was promoted to the media was the personal inflation calculator, launched some weeks ago. It was so popular among users that the server got overloaded. Austria is monitoring some indicators to assess the value of their products, but does not invest in mass media campaigns.

11. Canada communicates the value of official statistics to its citizens by ensuring its data holdings are broadly used, known and cited by influencers. This is done through regular client consultations; the national Statistical Information Service; the Official Release program; engagement with academia and researchers through the Research Data Centres Network; the popular StatCan website (25 million visits annually) with its Open Data portal and information of appeal to targeted audiences; comprehensive Media Relations services which results in 6,000 citations a year in mainstream media; outreach to businesses and community organizations; the well-attended *Talking Stats* event series

[2] Materials of the relevant sessions are available at: for 2012: www.unece.org/index.php?id=28542#/ and for 2008: www.unece.org/index.php?id=14436#/

[3] www1.unece.org/stat/platform/display/GAMSO

[4] See the group of countries and organisations in paragraph 3 of this paper.

where the Chief Statistician – joined by panels of experts – discuss statistical findings on different themes with the public; and a strong presence in social media with the StatCan Blog, the Blog for researchers, Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube channels. The success of the communication activities and channels is measured with a defined set of performance indicators to gage the level of reach, take-up rate, and engagement with the Canadian public.

12. Mexico uses innovative methodology to measure in monetary terms the market value of official statistical and geographical information used by the media. These data are used for an added value indicator to identify the preferences of the general public by sectors. INEGI also carries out positioning campaigns as part of their systematic and professional interaction with the media and to strengthen the society´s confidence in official statistics. Surveys to measure public trust in INEGI's statistics are conducted. INEGI applies an Open Data Policy (approved in 2014) and emphasizes the provision of information free of charge: "INEGI´s business is not to sell information, but to ensure that the information is used". Rather than promoting directly the value of official statistics, INEGI has in place mechanisms that prove the value and relevance of official statistics, for example the Quality Assurance System which is made visible to users. Use of innovative communication tools is an important part of this work, including posts in social media, call centers, account managers promoting INEGI's statistics to strategic users, services providing microdata access and state of the art web pages, upcoming video press releases, etc. Specific attention is paid to strategic users of statistics, for example, by providing tailored training programs on the use of statistics. For example, in January 2015, 280 workers of the Federal Audit Institution of Mexico were trained, and by the end of 2015, a total of 2,000 workers from the Institution will be trained.

13. In the United Kingdom, measuring the impact of official statistics is an important issue. Experience shows:

(a) The importance of knowing the full and true costs of particular statistics and blocks of statistics so as to assist prioritization and show the efficiency of the statistical system within necessarily constrained resources.

(b) The importance of knowing the benefits of particular statistics so as to better communicate the value of these statistics.

(d) The need to communicate the existence and implications of statistics so as to maximize their value to decision makers within the economy and society.

(e) The desirability of measuring the impact of official statistics so as to guide future production and dissemination methods towards an optimal outcome.

(f) The need to be able to demonstrate the benefits and impact of official statistics so as to guide the allocation of national resources towards statistics commensurate with the benefits they yield.

14. While work is going on in the United Kingdom on all of these issues, the problems to be faced are tractable but non-trivial. Agreeing on methods for cost estimation internationally would be valuable, saving the need to reinvent wheels and also enabling some level of comparability.

IV. Strands of further work

15. Existing CES activities, described in Section III A., provide an important basis for advancing the work on communicating the value of official statistics. These existing work strands should be brought together and combined with countries' remaining challenges in

order to form a road-map and priorities on the way forward in estimating and communicating the value of official statistics.

16. Further work to achieve recognition of the value of official statistics has affinity with the formulation of the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics, developed by the CES and endorsed by the UN General Assembly in 2014. The following general approach is proposed:

- Initial work to identify and agree on the key issues generally faced in the valuation of official statistics and their marketing;
- Assemble evidence of good practice in these key issues;
- Form a synthesis of the key issues faced and good practices for mutual learning and development of a common framework, bearing in mind that implementation needs to be tailored to countries' circumstances and needs.

17. The overall strategy or work programme for estimating and communicating the value of official statistics could consist of three work strands:

- Work strand 1: Improving the marketing of the value of official statistics.
- Work strand 2: Valuing the costs or inputs of producing official statistics.
- Work strand 3: Valuing the impact of official statistics. Analyzing both the inputs and outputs of official statistics would enable measuring the efficiency of compiling official statistics.

A. Work strand 1: Improving the marketing of the value of official statistics

18. So far, the focus of current CES activities in this area has been on the communication and outreach of official statistics rather than specifically on communicating the value of official statistics. The following steps would help to strengthen the focus on the value of official statistics:

(a) Establish what is going on internationally and nationally to decide what needs to be done. This would require collaboration with the HLG Modernisation Committee on Products and Sources in the planned HLG follow-up survey to collect information on ongoing activities relating especially to communicating the value of official statistics;

(b) Identify and share good practices on communicating and marketing the value of official statistics using the HLG survey. Create an inventory or a knowledge base of good practices, as planned by the Modernisation Committee;

(c) National statistical offices have communication strategies some of which include actions to promote the value of official statistics. Based on these, develop common priorities and tools for communicating the value of official statistics.

Mechanism:

19. HLG Modernization Committee on Products and Sources would be best placed to deal with the communication and marketing aspects of the value of official statistics.

20. Work Sessions on Communication of Statistics would provide a platform for sharing experience on communicating and marketing the value of official statistics.

B. Work strand 2: Valuing the costs or inputs of producing official statistics

21. It has been difficult to develop comparable measures of costs of producing official statistics. The following steps would help to assess the possibility to value the costs of producing official statistics in a more consistent and internationally comparable way:

(a) Share information on existing good practice in using GSBPM for cost estimation. Using the GSBPM and its extension, GAMSO, for estimating the costs of statistical production seems to be a promising tool for deriving more comparable cost measures;

(b) Additional countries could test the use of GSBPM and GAMSO for cost estimation based on the lessons learned in Estonia and Ireland;

(c) Draft practical advice on estimating the costs of statistical production based on the lessons learned during the testing phase.

Mechanism:

22. HLG Modernization Committee on Standards is in charge of developing GSBPM and GAMSO and would be best placed to carry this work strand forward.

C. Work strand 3: Valuing the impact of official statistics

23. Measuring whether official statistics deliver outputs that have an important impact on society would provide substantive arguments for promoting official statistics. The following steps would enable assessing the possibility to value the impact of official statistics:

(a) Establish what is going on internationally and nationally to quantify the value of official statistics and collect information on any good practices;

(b) Review examples of how other industries are measuring and communicating the value of their output;

(c) Develop a common framework to measure and understand the benefits and impact of official statistics on society;

(d) Develop indicators to measure the value of official statistics. This could include simple measures, such as number of hits on websites that provide statistical data and services; and number of citations to released statistics and statistical publications. On the other hand, more complex indicators could be developed, e.g. on policy decisions influenced by statistics and for cost-benefit analysis related to investing in official statistics. This could include assessing the possibility to put an economic value to official statistics, e.g. the monetary value of carrying out a population census;

(e) Encourage testing of the indicator framework in countries and collect and analyse the data to find evidence of the value of official statistics and any correlations between good governance and investment into official statistics;

(f) Draft a convincing narrative that can be used for better communicating the value of official statistics. Such a narrative could be discussed and endorsed by the Conference.

Mechanism:

24. Phase 1: Create a Task Force on valuing the impact of official statistics since no group is currently working on these issues. The current group led by the United Kingdom could constitute the Task Force and draft the terms of reference to cover the above steps (a) to (d) with the following activities:

- Define what is meant by the value of official statistics and what is it that the users really value in official statistics[5].
- Liaise with the other CES groups to ensure cohesion, avoid duplication and generate a stronger focus on the value of official statistics in the related activities.
- Review the current practices, measurement frameworks and indicators that may exist in statistical offices for the purposes of valuing their impact.
- Collect examples of how other industries are measuring and communicating the value of their output.
- Assess the feasibility of developing a framework with a set of indicators that could be implemented by countries for valuing the impact of official statistics.

25. The Task Force would provide their first findings later in 2015.

26. Phase 2: Based on the outcome of the Task Force work, carry out a pilot testing of the possible framework and a set of indicators in countries. Collect and analyse the information and develop a convincing narrative showcasing the value of official statistics.

V. Decision by the CES Bureau

27. The Bureau strongly supported the proposal, including the following work strands:

(a) Valuing the impact of official statistics (work strand 3), to be led by a new Task Force. This area requires intensive effort to establish a framework and indicators for measuring the value of official statistics. The Task Force should also coordinate all CES activities related to the value of official statistics;

(b) Improving the marketing of the value of official statistics (work strand 1) to be led by the HLG Modernization Committee on Products and Sources in line with their current work plans. The Work Sessions on Communication of Statistics provide a platform for exchanging experience in this area;

(c) Valuing the costs of producing official statistics (work strand 2) to be led by the HLG Modernization Committee on Standards, especially to share current experience and practices in using CES standards as a basis for cost estimation.

28. The Bureau decided to establish a Task Force on the value of official statistics and asked the group of countries and organizations, led by the United Kingdom, to prepare the terms of reference (see the proposed draft terms of reference in Annex I).

29. The following countries and international organisations have expressed interest in participating in the Task Force: the United Kingdom (chair), Austria, Canada, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Eurostat and OECD. Additional countries and organisations interested in participating are asked to contact UNECE Secretariat: anu.peltola@unece.org

[5] Building value should be based on responding to users' preferences including continuous improvement of technology use, innovation, user orientation, real time information, free access, problem solving, simplicity, certified quality, security, confidentiality, strategic partnerships etc.

Annex I

Draft terms of reference of the Task Force on the Value of Official Statistics[6]

I. Background

1. The issue of valuing the impact of official statistics is closely linked to the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics that provide unique criteria to ensure the production of objective and reliable information for everyone. Regardless of the central role of official statistics in informing decision makers and society at large, stakeholders sometimes fail to see the value of official statistics. Currently, tight budget constraints are imposed on many national statistical offices, despite the growing demand for statistics globally and challenges arising from the increasingly competitive information industry.

2. Under these conditions, the need for international work to define and measure the value of official statistics and its impact on decision making has become ever more important to enable:

- Defining, in the midst of Data Revolution, what is the business of official statistics.
- Conveying the reasons why investment in official statistics should be made.
- Pooling together good practices of statistical offices to support learning.
- Identifying and developing better ways to explain the value of official statistics.

3. In April 2014, the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) held a seminar on "What is the value of official statistics and how do we communicate that value?" The Conference stated that the value of official statistics should be promoted as a global asset, and called for cooperation and joint actions at the international level, for example to develop a common language and terminology related to the value of official statistics; and to measure the economic value of official statistics through collection of case studies.

4. In October 2014, the CES Bureau discussed follow-up to the recommended actions, and asked a group of interested countries and organizations to develop a road-map to explore the key aspects to be covered in further work on the value of official statistics. A group composed of the United Kingdom (chair), Austria, Canada, Mexico, OECD and UNECE prepared a concept note on the way forward which the CES Bureau discussed at its meeting in February 2015. The CES Bureau decided to establish a task force to develop ways to value the impact of official statistics.

II. Mandate

5. The Task Force work is conducted within the framework of CES and its Bureau. The Task Force will submit an interim report and a final report to the CES Bureau.

[6] For approval for the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians.

III. Objective

6. The objective of the Task Force will be to define the value of official statistics and develop ways for its measurement that will allow for better understanding and communication of this value to society. The Task Force will assess the feasibility of developing a framework and a set of indicators for valuing the impact of official statistics.

7. The Task Force will liaise with the related CES groups that deal with communication issues to ensure cohesion, avoid duplication and encourage a stronger focus on the value of official statistics.

IV. Planned activities and outputs

8. The Task Force will undertake its work in two phases. During the first phase the following activities will be carried out:

(a) Define what is meant by the value of official statistics:

(i) Consider what the users and stakeholders value in official statistics;

(ii) Collect cases showcasing the value of official statistics for decision making;

(iii) Consider how official statisticians can build additional value by working jointly with the private sector or other stakeholders. An in-depth review of strategic partnerships with stakeholders in the information industry, to be prepared by Canada, will feed into this work;

(b) Explore how other industries are measuring and communicating the value of their output;

(c) Review current practices, measurement frameworks and indicators that may exist in statistical offices for valuing the impact of official statistics;

(d) Develop ways to measure the value of official statistics:

(i) Identify possible indicators that could show the value of official statistics;

(ii) Develop a framework with a set of indicators, if considered feasible;

(e) Recommend actions for promoting and increasing the value of official statistics.

9. The output of this phase will be a report which defines the value of official statistics and suggests how to measure it and how to promote better understanding of this value.

10. During the second phase, the work will continue with:

(a) Pilot testing of the indicator framework in countries;

(b) Collecting and analysing data to find evidence of the value of official statistics and any correlations between good governance and investment into official statistics;

(c) Drafting a convincing narrative that can be used for better communication of the value of official statistics.

V. Timetable

11. The first activities of the Task Force for the period from early 2015 to early 2016, are planned according to the following tentative timetable:

Timing	Task
Mar-Apr 2015	Agree on the terms of reference and the work plan; Identify task leaders and launch work on tasks (a) to (c)
May-Jul 2015	Analyse the findings of the explorative HLG survey and the findings from tasks (a) to (c)
Aug-Oct 2015	Launch work to identify possible indicators and to develop a framework for valuing the impact of official statistics (d)
Nov-Dec 2015	Consider recommended actions for promoting better understanding of the value of official statistics (e)
Dec 2015	Submit an interim report to the CES Bureau
Feb 2016	Consider feedback from the CES Bureau and finalise the report
Mar 2016	Submit the interim report to the April 2016 CES plenary session for discussion

VI. Methods of work

12. The Task Force will primarily work via email and telephone conferences. Face-to-face meetings may be organized, preferably on the occasion of events attended by a significant number of Task Force members. Participation to the meetings will be self-funded.

13. The Task Force will liaise with the UNECE High-Level Group Modernisation Committee on Products and Sources that is dealing with the communication and marketing aspects of the value of official statistics and with the Modernisation Committee on Standards that is developing standard tools for statistical production that can also be used for cost estimation. The Work Sessions on the Communication of Statistics provide a possible platform for discussing issues emerging from the Task Force work.

VII. Membership

14. The following countries and international organisations have expressed interest in participating in the Task Force: the United Kingdom (chair), Austria, Canada, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Eurostat and OECD.

15. UNECE acts as Secretariat to the Task Force.

United Nations ECE/CES/2015/6

Economic and Social Council

Distr : General
22 May 2015

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-third plenary session
Geneva, 15-17 June 2015
Item 5 (c) of the provisional agenda
Recommendations for the 2020 Round of Population and Housing Censuses

Results of the consultation on the Conference of European Statisticians' Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing

Note by the Secretariat

Summary

The note summarizes the comments made by members of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) on the *CES Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing* (ECE/CES/2015/6/Add.1). The secretariat carried out the electronic consultation in March-April 2015.

A total of 58 countries and international organisations replied. The responding countries and organisations supported the endorsement of the recommendations.

Respondents also provided comments on the Recommendations. This note presents the substantive comments received, together with the replies of the UNECE Steering Group on Population and Housing Censuses, which include some suggestions for amendments to the Recommendations addressing the comments received.

In view of the support received, the *CES Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing* are submitted to the Conference for endorsement, subject to the amendments presented in this note.

GE.15-10384 (E)
1510384

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. This note summarizes comments made by members of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) on the *CES Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing*. The Secretariat carried out an electronic consultation on the recommendations in March-April 2015.

2. CES members were asked to structure their comments according to a set of questions on general and specific comments. The questionnaire used for the consultation also contained a set of questions on the national plans for the 2020 census round (Part 2, to be filled only by national statistical offices). The results of this part of the questionnaire are not presented in this note, but will be presented by UNECE at the September 2015 UNECE-Eurostat expert meeting on censuses, and will be used to plan future UNECE activities in this field.

3. The following 58 countries and international organisations replied to the consultation: Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Eurostat, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CISSTAT), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The United Nations Statistics Division submitted specific comments on text related to population bases, and the European Federation of National Organisations working with the Homeless (FEANTSA) submitted specific comments on text related to the enumeration of the homeless.

II. General comments

4. All responding countries and organisations supported the endorsement of the recommendations by CES[1].

5. All responding countries and organisations also indicated that the recommendations provide useful guidance on planning and conducting population and housing censuses, and on improving comparability of census results across countries[1].

6. Many countries acknowledged the value of the recommendations as the basis for their work in the field of censuses. General remarks of appreciation for the importance and usefulness of the recommendations and the high quality of the new revision were formulated by several countries including: Armenia, Australia, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Mexico, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Tajikistan and United States.

7. Among the various general comments, Finland noted that "the new recommendations are comprehensive and especially the register-based censuses have been taken into account excellently". Sweden also found it positive that the new

[1] Denmark did not reply to the question but specified that its census is compiled from administrative registers and complies with the Eurostat regulations on the subject.

recommendations have been more adapted to the situation of countries conducting a register-based census, expressing "hope that the development will continue, since more countries move towards using registers to a greater extent". The United States noted that its census is mostly consistent with the CES Recommendations and the United Nations Statistics Division's (UNSD) global Principles and Recommendations, and that they are particularly useful when collaborating with other national statistical offices (NSOs) to gain a broad general knowledge of census taking in the UNECE region and around the world.

8. Some countries, while supporting the adoption of the recommendations, made some general remarks or suggestions for improvement. Austria noted that in part 2 and 3 (on population and housing topics respectively), the situation of register-based census countries should be given greater consideration. Chile suggested that the document would be even more useful if the methodological aspects were presented in more detail. Germany observed that for European Union (EU) countries the needs and possibilities for delivering certain core-topics and non-core-topics are being discussed in the Eurostat Task Force on Future Censuses. Poland reminded that, as a EU member state, it is obliged to follow the European Commission Regulation on population and housing censuses concerning data sources, definitions and classifications of topics, but the CES Recommendations are useful for the topics that are not included in the legal documents for the EU member states. Poland also recognized that some difficulties with the international comparability of the data might arise.

III. Specific comments on various chapters of the Recommendations

9. Several countries also provided specific comments on various chapters of the Recommendations. The substantive comments are presented in this section, together with the responses by the Steering Group (SG) on Population and Housing Censuses, summarized at the end of each chapter.

A. Chapter I - Methodology

10. Chile suggested that the methodologies mentioned in the chapter require more detail, and noted that Latin American countries still use the traditional census method based on field enumeration, so further development of this issue would be recommendable.

11. Estonia noted that the text in para 39 on key user requirement criteria for census topics needs some clarification. In particular, the "strong and clearly defined user need" and "content that does not differ drastically from previous censuses" should be clarified. Estonia also proposed to add the following text to **Paragraph 39 (b)**:

(b) data on the topic are required for small population groups and/or at detailed geographical levels, and are expected to be used in multivariate analyses with other census topics, <u>according to the confidentiality rules</u>.

12. Ireland noted that the choice for countries between running a *de facto* or a *de jure* census needs to be explained, along with the benefits and disadvantages between the two, in the context of the different population counts.

13. Romania observed that more explanations and technical details about rolling census would be very useful.

14. The United States suggested the following amendments (new text is underlined, and words to be deleted are shown in strikethrough), clarifying the methodology of the United States census:

Paragraph 58: *There are three basic approaches to conducting a census, based on the method of data collection:*

(a)…

- a traditional (short form) enumeration with annual updates of characteristics (long form data) on a sample basis (United States), and…

Paragraph 89: *The survey samples a percentage of addresses each year to approximate a long form sampling rate over a ~~certain~~ period of ~~the census cycle, such as four or~~ five years.*

In the United States, where this approach has been implemented, the sample size is fixed at 3.54 million housing unit addresses which is a sampling rate of approximately 2.5 per cent. Annual sampling rates for the American Community Survey (ACS), depending on the size of the geographic area, ~~at various geographic levels~~ range from 0.51 per cent to 15 per cent. Over a five-year period, with the fixed sample size of 3.54 million housing unit addresses, the sampling rates range from 2.55 per cent to 75 per cent.

Paragraph 90: *Delete the sentence: ~~Three-year estimates are produced for areas with populations of 20,000 or greater.~~*

Paragraph 91: *The survey data must be weighted ~~to the population totals~~ to produce reliable and useable estimates… This final weighting adjustment helps to ensure that estimates of the characteristics are comparable to official population estimates. ~~the standard periodic census~~*

15. CISSTAT suggested adding the following sentence:

Paragraph 82: (at the end of paragraph) *The exception of it may be the traditional holidays (for example, "day of reindeer herder" in Russia) for the nomadic population, which is collected in certain places for a short period of time.* This sentence would represent an exception to the recommendation that traditional holidays are unsuitable times for the census enumeration.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

16. Concerning the comment by Chile and Romania, SG considers that the level of detail of the methodologies presented is adequate for the purpose of these recommendations, which cannot be as detailed as a technical manual. More detailed information on traditional censuses is available in UNSD's Principles and Recommendations, as already indicated in the Recommendations in paragraph 74.

17. Concerning the comments by Estonia, SG does not consider it necessary to further clarify the text in paragraph 39 (a) and (d). SG suggests adding the text:

Paragraph 39 (b): (at the end of paragraph) *…respecting data confidentiality principles.*

18. Concerning the comment by Ireland, SG suggests adding the following:

Paragraph 82: (at the end of paragraph) *Where a de facto Census is carried out it will be necessary to request each person enumerated away from home to state their usual residence address and code this address to a detailed level of geography to ensure that usually resident population counts can be calculated at a detailed level of geography. Usually resident persons who are abroad on Census night for a period of less than 12 months should also be counted. This can be achieved by requesting details of the person absent on Census night from the household.*

19. SG also suggests accepting the amendments proposed by United States and CISSTAT.

B. Chapter II - Technology

20. Colombia observed that the text on data capture devices presents the advantages and technical difficulties, however, no reference is made to the implications regarding the quality and use of the information. For example, it may be needed to significantly expand the collection period as it is not viable to have sufficient mobile capture devices to cover the country in a single day.

21. Estonia submitted the following comment: "Technologies for use would be useful, including descriptions of the various activities, and examples how to properly manage the census. Drivers for technological innovation are sufficient."

22. Ireland commented that given the importance of the geographical dimension of census data, and the vital link between persons and dwellings, this section should address the issue of individuals responding to the census on their mobile device (on the train to work for example). As mobile devices become more prevalent, more and more countries readily facilitate mobile response. This may lead to the risk of fragmentation of the data, both in terms of a threat to the integrity of the concept of household, and to the vital link between the individual and the dwelling. This issue should be raised.

23. Romania suggested that it would be useful to provide more detailed explanations and country's experiences with the use of new technologies.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

24. SG considers that the level of detail of the text presented in this chapter is adequate for the purpose of the Recommendations, which cannot be as detailed as a technical manual. Concerning the comment by Ireland, SG suggests adding the following underlined text:

Paragraph 196 (b): *Screen size may affect the ability of the enumerator to record and verify responses accurately. For the same reason, countries considering the option of Internet response with mobile devices should be aware of the risk of fragmentation of the data (with a threat to the integrity of the concept of household, and the link between the individual and the dwelling) due to the small size of the screens.*

C. Chapter III - Field and other operational activities

25. Ireland suggested that the recommendations should give some guidelines on publication timeliness, for example indicating what percentage of UNECE countries published their first results within one year of Census day in the 2010 round. This could be based on the result of the questionnaire sent to UNECE countries.

26. CISSTAT suggested the following amendment:

Paragraph 287: *...But young people, especially young men...*

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

27. Concerning the suggestion by Ireland, SG considers that it would be difficult to give guidelines concerning the timeliness of the publication of the results, as this depends on various factors including the census method used. Moreover, the existence of trade-offs between timeliness of results and other dimensions of quality (see paragraphs 350-356)

seems to suggest that it is preferable not to give guidelines concerning timeliness. SG suggests accepting the amendment proposed by CISSTAT.

D. Chapter IV - Quality management

28. Colombia noted that in the text on operational quality control it is mentioned that quality errors, including coverage, should be detected and the corrective actions should be generated before the end of the collection phase; however, the mechanisms or tools to carry out these actions are not specified.

29. France suggested that it could be useful to get more operational advice to improve the quality of censuses, and possibly to promote exchange of experiences among countries on how to control the quality of the data produced.

30. Mexico observed that it would be useful to add additional examples of quality indicators to make it clear how to make the topic objective, and to be able to evaluate the census's quality.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

31. SG considers that the level of detail of the text presented in this chapter is adequate for the purpose of these recommendations. However, SG takes note of the fact that more guidance could be needed on census quality management, and recommends that technical guidelines in this field should be produced if possible.

E. Chapter V - Population bases

32. Austria and Latvia noted that in paragraph 410, after the first sentence, there is some text starting with "(b)", but there no previous text starting with "(a)", and suggested that the text starting with "(b)" should be possibly deleted.

33. Austria and the United Kingdom noted an inconsistency in the table on the place of residence for workers and students (Table 1 after paragraph 411). According to the table as it is, tertiary students studying abroad and returning home regularly should be included in the usually resident population of the country, but their place of usual residence within the country should be their term time address, which is actually outside the country. The United Kingdom noted that to be consistent with the global recommendations and the steer at the September 2014 Expert group meeting, students should be counted at their term-time address even if that is outside of the country of their family home to which they return regularly. The corresponding text at paragraph 411 should also be changed to be consistent with any amendments made in Table 1. The recommended reporting for workers is correct and should remain as presented.

34. Germany noted that in its country the registered place of residence will be used based on the regulations of the Federal Registration Act.

35. Romania noted that it would be preferable to explain better what is meant by the term "geographical place" in paragraph 397 (what does it mean: the locality, the exact address?). Moreover, the definitions of "continuous period of time" in paragraph 398 and of "virtual place" in paragraph 413 should be clarified.

36. The Russian Federation observed that in table 1 (after paragraph 411) the category of workers who work abroad and regularly do not return to family ('Regular' is taken to mean more than twice each month), are not enumerated by the place of their residence. However, work at gas and oil fields is performed on a rotational basis. The rotation may

last 1-2 months, after which the workers return to their family home and may either stay in their home country or return in 1-2 months. Therefore they are residing abroad for less than 12 months. Thus rotation workers should be enumerated in the country where they live with their families in case the workers are residing abroad for less than 12 months.

37. UNSD noted that the comparison between the text on population count, population base, and related concepts in the CES Recommendations (paragraphs 393-394) and the corresponding text in the *Principles and Recommendations (P&Rs) on Population and Housing Censuses* – Revision 3 (paragraph 4.23) may create confusion. UNSD also specified the following: "The main inconsistency between two recommendations seems that the P&R uses the term of "population count or population base" for the population(s) which is/are derived from the enumerated population, while the UNECE defines the term of population base(s) as theoretical definitions which can be adopted by a country. Actually, it seems that definition of population count suggested by the UNECE/Eurostat is more coherent with the concepts of "population count or population base" given in the P&R, but this still needs to be confirmed. For Europe in which many countries use administrative registers in conducting population census, detailed population concepts might be needed and as a consequence definitions of some concepts might be to some extent different from the P&R. However, there is no explanation available in the UNECE document regarding how definitions of population concepts are related to the use of administrative registers, so that users of these documents would better interpret the differences."

38. European Federation of National Organisations working with the Homeless (FEANTSA) observed that the notion of "vagrants" (in paragraph 412 (a)) is potentially stigmatizing, and suggested to remove it. FEANTSA also noted that the definition of homelessness covers an exhaustive range of living situations for people without a home, while the notion of 'persons with no concept of usual residence' is rather confusing. People 'without a usual residence' would be a more appropriate formulation.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

39. SG confirms that the text starting with "(b)" in paragraph 410, after the first sentence, was copied by mistake and should be deleted.

40. SG acknowledges the inconsistency in table 1 after paragraph 411, as noted by Austria and the United Kingdom. SG recommends correcting the table (and the text in paragraph 411) as suggested by the United Kingdom, so that students in tertiary education studying abroad should be counted at their term-time address (abroad) and therefore should not be included in the usually resident population of the country where their family lives. This correction would be in line with the global UNSD Principles and Recommendations, and with the decisions taken on this subject at the September 2014 UNECE-Eurostat Expert Meeting on Censuses.

41. Concerning the comments by Romania, SG clarifies that a definition of geographical place is given in paragraph 416, that "continuous period of time" means without interruption (except for short absences as specified in the third sentence of paragraph 398), and that "virtual place" should be intended as a virtual region of the country of departure, not corresponding to a real geographical region.

42. Concerning the comment by Russia, SG clarifies that if workers at gas or oil fields return home before one year of absence and they remain at their place for a relatively long period (such as 1-2 months), they should actually be considered as temporarily absent (the same way as a seasonal worker) and therefore included in the population of the family home country/region.

43. Concerning the comment by UNSD, SG considers that there is no inconsistency between the CES Recommendations and the Principles and Recommendations, but the text

of the CES Recommendations is simply more specific than the text in the P&R. The term "population count" in the CES Recommendations introduces and defines the difference with the population estimate. If there was no adjustment, and hence no population estimate, then the definition would be the same as in the P&R - this is also covered in 4.25 in the P&R. This is explained in the Charts 1 and 2 after paragraph 395 which also includes an adjustment.

44. SG suggests accepting the amendments proposed by FEANTSA.

F. Chapter VI - Geographic characteristics

45. Austria suggested that paragraph 426 (location of living quarters) could be moved to beginning of chapter VI, right after paragraphs 415 and 416, location of place of residence.

46. Estonia suggested adding a clarification to the following text:

Paragraph 421: *Localities, as defined above, should not be confused with the smallest civil divisions of a country. In some cases, the two may coincide.*

47. France, with reference to paragraph 438 on using grid statistics, suggested adding a reference to the fact that there is a question of significance of the data, especially when the data come from a sample like in the rolling census.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

48. SG does not consider necessary moving paragraph 426 after paragraph 416, or providing further clarification in paragraph 421. Concerning the comment by France, SG suggests amending the text in as follows:

Paragraph 438: *...However, grid statistics may give rise to concerns over confidentiality or significance of the data in thinly populated areas, or when data come from a sample source...*

G. Chapter VII - Demographic characteristics

49. Australia suggested, for the non-core topic 'total number of children born alive' (paragraphs 480-482), that it may be useful to add a note regarding the potential sensitivity of this topic for mothers who have experienced still-births so that this can be considered in the testing programme. There may also be data quality issues due to the potential inclusion of adopted children or exclusion of children adopted out, despite instructions to the contrary.

50. Austria made the following comments:

(a) **Paragraph 462** (Age) says *...Date of birth also allows the calculation of age made in respect of points in time other than at census reference day.* However, paragraph 396 states that the "census day/period" is the day/period on/during which a census is carried out and should not be confused with the census reference time.

(b) **Paragraph 470:** (Legal marital status, alternative classification): *If "registered or other legal partnership" is introduced, the equivalent categories of widowed and divorced should also be added: "registered partnership ended with the death of partner" and "registered partnership legally dissolved".*

(c) **Paragraph 477:** (De facto marital status): the proposed distinction within category (1.0) between (1.1) "Persons living with opposite-sex spouse or partner" and (1.2) "Person living with same-sex spouse or partner" does not provide separate data on

"marriages" and "cohabitations". The proposed distinction only provides separate data on persons living in a heterosexual and same-sex partnership. Separate data on "marriages" and "cohabitations" are provided by cross-tabulating de facto marital status with legal marital status. In our opinion, further distinctions of the de facto marital status are unnecessary.

51. Mexico reported that in its census only the "marital status" (and not the legal marital status) is collected, because what matters is the *de facto* status, not *de jure*.

52. Slovakia expressed dissatisfaction because its recommendation for the classification of *de facto* marital status (paragraph 474) was not accepted. Slovakia had proposed to distinguish the spouses and the partners because the traditional families are still the basis for human society, and added a comment that: "Families have gone through major changes in recent decades, therefore we need data with high informative value, which are usable for analysis of family behaviour and subsequently for population and family policies. Moreover, in many countries these data are available only from the census survey. So, we still do not consider mixing the marriages and the cohabitations as good practice."

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

53. Concerning the comment by Australia, SG suggests adding the following sentence:

Paragraph 481: (at the beginning of paragraph) *Countries should be aware of the potential sensitivity of this topic for mothers who have experienced still-births. This issue should be carefully considered in the testing programme...*

54. Concerning the comments by Austria, SG suggests amending the text as follows:

Paragraph 462: *...Date of birth also allows the calculation of age made in respect of points in time other than at census reference ~~day~~ time.*

Paragraph 470: *Alternatively, one example of how the classification at paragraph 467 may be expanded is: ~~to include~~ ...*

Paragraph 477: *An optional distinction ... might be considered by countries that would like to produce ~~separate data on 'marriages' and 'cohabitations'~~ more detailed data for the purposes...*

55. Concerning the comment by Slovakia, SG noted that the proposal by Slovakia was discussed at the September 2014 UNECE-Eurostat Expert meeting on censuses, but there was limited support and it was not accepted. The proposal by Slovakia included a cross-classification of categories of legal and de facto marital status, and the participants considered that it was preferable to keep the two topics separate.

H. Chapter VIII - Economic characteristics

56. Austria observed that presenting the definition of "place of work" in a box (paragraph 555) is misleading, since it will appear to be a topic which it is not. "Location of place of work" is the topic which refers to the geographical location (paragraph 445). Austria proposed to include the definition of place of work into the box of the current paragraph 557 (and making a reference to paragraph 445-450) and to delete paragraph 556.

57. Estonia, with reference to text on the 2013 ICLS Resolution, requested clarification concerning the underlined text:

Box 1 (after paragraph 491): *...the updated international standards would ideally be implemented over time...,* and suggested adding a timetable concerning the text: *...During the transition period, it is of utmost importance that the institutions...*

58. Malta noted that, further to the feedback received during the March 2015 Meeting of the Eurostat Task Force on the Future EU Censuses, the category 'Members of producers cooperatives' in the core topic 'Status in employment' (paragraph 543), will no longer be required at EU level and Malta will probably not include it in the next census.

58. Romania made the following comments:

(a) The whole chapter is based on the criteria of "previous 7 days", which makes impossible to use information included in administrative data sources (especially criteria used for definition of unemployed persons). In other words, it will not be possible to determine indicators about economic participation of people at the smallest territorial levels for countries which intend to carry-out census without field data collection.

(b) It is not specified whether the variable "place of work" (paragraph 555) is a core or non-core topic.

(c) The topics on income (paragraphs 574 – 586) are not directly linked with censuses' objectives; they increase the respondent burden and can compromise the whole data collection involving very sensitive issues as level and sources of income. There are other specialized sample surveys which estimate the level of income. In order to produce comparable statistics, a common classification of socio-economic groups is needed.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

59. SG proposes to remove the box from paragraph 555, as proposed by Austria, to make clear that "place of work" is not a census topic. SG does not consider necessary to move the definition of place of work or to modify the text of paragraphs 555-556.

60. SG considers that the text in Box 1 does not need further clarification, as "the updated international standards" refers clearly to the recommendations of the 2013 ICLS Resolution, and no timetable can be specified for the transition period.

61. Concerning the comments by Romania, SG notes that the text has been revised keeping in mind that some countries use administrative data for their census; "place of work" (paragraph 555) is not a census topic (the box will be removed to avoid the misunderstanding); the two non-core income topics in some countries are considered not suitable for the census for the reasons mentioned by Romania, but in other countries are commonly accepted as census topics; no common classification of socio-economic groups is provided as there is no international standard classification, and because countries considering this topic are likely to adopt a classification that takes into account the national circumstances.

I. Chapter IX - Agriculture

62. Australia suggested that it could be useful for the chapter to include examples of how the two censuses could be linked in developed countries where agriculture is not confined to the household sector, including examples of how the issue of the different enumeration units in the two censuses (business vs household) could be overcome.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

63. SG notes that various examples of country practices are presented in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) *Guidelines for Linking Population and Housing Censuses with Agricultural Censuses*, mentioned in paragraph 598 and footnote 43.

J. Chapter X - Educational characteristics

64. Estonia noted that the purpose of the following text is not clear (in the context of the topic educational attainment):

Paragraph 609: *Countries should also consider collecting further information that captures data on levels of education not successfully completed. This may be achieved by asking whether a higher level than the one attained has been started and interrupted, or studies are ongoing at the higher level. Alternatively, a question on the highest grade completed may be appropriate in this context.*

65. Mexico commented that school attendance should be a core topic, specifically for people under 21, since education is a fundamental right.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

66. With regard to the comment by Estonia, the SG clarified that the text refers to education levels and education grades (within levels). For the topic of educational attainment, countries should collect with priority data on the highest education level successfully completed. In addition, they may also collect data (on an optional basis) on education level not successfully completed. As an alternative, data could be collected on the highest grade completed (from which information can be derived on the education levels successfully completed or not completed).

67. School attendance was proposed and agreed by UNECE countries as a non-core topic at the 2013 and 2014 expert meetings, and no proposals were made to consider it as a core topic.

K. Chapter XI - Migration

68. Colombia noted that the text of the Recommendations refers to the difficulties encountered in obtaining the information regarding persons who migrate abroad (for instance in paragraph 402 in the chapter on population bases), but it does not present any recommendation or development on the subject, which would be useful to include.

69. Estonia suggested adding a new topic on the place of birth of grandparents. Based on this information it would be possible to identify the third generation of migrants.

70. Germany made the following comments, related to the German census:

(a) For the country of citizenship, dependent territories cannot be identified;

(b) Internal migration: For people born in the country the information about the "place of birth" cannot be determined at the level of the smallest civil division;

(c) The topic "previous place for usual residence and date of arrival in the current place" can only be implemented in the reduced mode.

71. Ireland observed that, regarding internal migration (paragraphs 680 – 691), clarity is required around the use of 'reduced mode' and whether or not there is a requirement to collect month of arrival in such circumstances.

72. Malta asked to clarify what is meant by 'smallest civil division' referred to in the variable 'Place of birth', adding that if it refers to the actual municipality or similar level of detail about where the birth took place, this is not available in Malta.

73. Mexico noted that in their country it is considered preferable to collect data on place of residence at a specific date (1, 3 or 5 years before the census) rather than the previous

place of residence, as the respondent has difficulty remembering the accurate date of arrival.

74. Romania noted that in order to strengthen the international comparisons, it would be preferable to propose two alternative approaches, at least for core topics (i.e. country of birth). The definition and use of unique classifications and nomenclatures would also be preferable.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

75. With regard to the comment from Colombia, SG suggests to add in paragraph 402 a reference to the document "Measuring Emigration at the Census: lessons learned from four country experiences"
(http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.41/2008/11.e.pdf)

76. Concerning the comment by Estonia, SG considers that collecting information on the place of birth of grandparents in a census would be complex, and the quality of the information collected could often not be sufficiently good.

77. Concerning the comment by Ireland, SG clarifies that under the reduced mode only the place of usual residence one year prior to the census has to be considered.

78. Concerning the comment by Malta, the smallest civil division can vary from country to country, but in many countries it is the municipality.

79. Concerning the comment by Romania, SG clarifies that in a few cases the recommendations propose two alternative approaches when it was not possible to have a common agreement on one of the two approaches. On country of birth, for instance, a number of countries supported the principle of the place where the birth occurred, while others supported the principle of the place of residence of the mother at the time of the census.

L. Chapter XII - Ethno-cultural characteristics

80. Chile suggested that the chapter should outline the scope of Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in independent countries, International Labour Organization (ILO).

81. Mexico commented that ethnicity should be a core topic because in most of the cases ethnic minorities are vulnerable people who require attention by the state.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

82. SG considers that the convention mentioned by Chile is mostly not relevant in CES member countries that are the main target of the CES Recommendations. For the comment by Mexico, SG notes that in many CES countries ethnicity is considered a sensitive topic not suitable for the census, and in some countries it would not be possible by law to collect this information. Therefore it should be considered as a non-core topic.

M. Chapter XIII - Disability

83. Russian Federation observed that the text on disability is not easy to understand and should be presented in a more user-friendly style.

84. Serbia noted that specific instructions on collecting data on disability among the youngest population are missing in the chapter. Recommendations on how to distinguish

between a child who develops in accordance with its age and a child with greater risk for experiencing restrictions in performing specific tasks or participating in role activities, which was discussed at a meeting in September 2014, would enable improvement of data quality and ensure unified approach of all countries.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses, after consultation with the Washington Group on Disability Statistics

85. Concerning the comment by the Russian Federation, SG recognizes that the text on disability is presented in a relatively technical style, due to the sensitivity and complexity of the subject. Further guidance, especially for countries with limited experience in collecting disability data in the census, is available on the website of the Washington Group on Disability Statistics, referenced in the recommendations. Concerning the comment by Serbia, SG suggests the following amendments to the text:

Paragraph 761: *...The disability questions should be addressed to each single household member aged 5 years and above and general questions on the presence of persons with disabilities in the household should be avoided. For children 2-4 years of age, only the domains seeing, hearing and walking would be considered suitable, while no questions are suitable for the population 0-2 years of age. If necessary, a proxy respondent can be used to report for the family member who is incapacitated or temporarily absent...*

N. Chapter XIV - Household and family characteristics

86. Austria suggested moving paragraph 849 to the beginning of chapter XIV, after paragraph 780, because the issue of how to make a distinction between institutional and private households is addressed. Austria agrees, however, that there is a connection to "single or shared occupancy".

87. Austria also suggested that the text for the classification of topic "single or shared occupancy" should be corrected as follows since it applies to housing units (which include conventional dwellings and other housing units):

Paragraph 847: *The following classification of private households living in conventional dwellings and other housing units by single or shared occupancy is suggested for countries using the housekeeping unit concept of households:*

(1.0) Households living alone in a ~~dwelling~~ housing unit

(2.0) Households sharing a ~~dwelling~~ housing unit with one or more other households

88. Germany noted that in their country for the core-topic 'household status' the information about 'primary homeless persons' cannot be determined.

89. Romania commented that the classification for the topic 'family status' is very detailed and increases the respondents' burden. Romania also observed that for the majority of the topics information cannot be produced in a census without field data collection.

90. Russian Federation noted that the definition of "extended family" in paragraph 793 ("...group of two or more persons who live together in the same household and *who do not constitute a family nucleus...*") seems in contradiction with the text for topics "extended family status" (paragraph 822) and "type of extended family" (paragraph 835), where various types of extended families actually include family nuclei. Russia also suggested to add to the classification of "household status" (paragraph 811) a new item (1.2.4) - person living with relatives and non-relatives.

91. FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations working with the Homeless) advised not to use the terms "transients" (paragraph 783) and "rootless" (in paragraph 782 (2.9), which are stigmatizing. Sticking to primary and secondary homelessness would be preferable. FEANTSA suggests the following reformulations:

Paragraph 782 (2.0): *...This category includes persons with no place of usual residence who ~~move frequently between~~ make use of various types of accommodations (including dwellings, shelters, institutions for the homeless or other living quarters) and ~~but who at least~~ have a roof over their heads at the time of the census.*

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

92. SG suggests accepting the two proposals by Austria. Paragraph 849 should be moved after paragraph 780, but a cross-reference to the same paragraph should be included in the topic "single or shared occupancy".

93. With regard to the comment by Romania about the difficulty in producing the information for the topics in this chapter in a census without field data collection, SG notes that several countries with register-based censuses commented that the new draft recommendations adequately address the needs of their type of census, and did not report any specific problems for the topics in this chapter.

94. SG agrees with the comments made by the Russian Federation and suggests revising the corresponding text as follows:

Paragraph 793: *...It is recommended that an 'extended family' be defined for census purposes as a group of ~~two or more~~ persons who live together in the same household, including one or more family nuclei and other persons who do not constitute a family nucleus as defined above but are related to each other or to any members of any family nuclei in the same household (to a specified degree) through blood, marriage or adoption...*

95. SG also agrees with the Russian Federation's suggestion to add to the classification of "household status" (paragraph 811) a new item (1.2.4) - person living with relatives and non-relatives.

96. SG suggests accepting the amendments proposed by FEANTSA.

O. Chapter XV - Housing characteristics

97. Austria noted that in footnote 2 of Table 3 (after paragraph 876) the reference to enumeration unit "H=households" should be deleted, since in the table there are no topics relevant for this enumeration unit. Moreover, in some paragraphs, the term "at the time of the census" is used, while it would be more appropriate to use the term "census reference time" used in chapter V "Population Bases". Austria also suggested integrating the text of paragraphs 882-884 into one paragraph, with the following editorial revision:

Paragraph 882 (summarizing 882-884): *Conventional dwellings can be classified as being: occupied; of seasonal or secondary use; vacant; or having only persons who are not included in the census present.*

(a) A conventional dwelling is classified as an "occupied conventional dwelling" if it is a usual residence of one or more persons regardless of temporary absences at the census reference time such as holidays or stay in a hospital. An "occupant" of a conventional dwelling is a person who has usual residence in the dwelling.

(b) A conventional dwelling which is "reserved for secondary or seasonal use is classified as such even if the dwelling is temporarily occupied at the census reference time

by persons who are usually resident in another dwelling (an example is given in paragraph 912).

(c) A conventional dwelling is defined as being "vacant" if it is unoccupied because it is either for sale or rent, abandoned, due for demolition, or newly built and not yet occupied.

(d) A conventional dwelling is defined as a dwelling with persons not included in the census if the dwelling is (temporarily) occupied only by persons who are not included in the census such as visitors, short-term migrants, foreign military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

98. SG suggests accepting the proposals by Austria.

IV. Conclusion

99. All responding countries and organisations supported the endorsement of the recommendations.

100. The comments and views expressed during the electronic consultation were carefully reviewed by the UNECE Steering Group on Censuses. In many cases the Steering Group recommends amendments to the Recommendations to address the issues raised by the countries and organisations. In other cases the Steering Group provides clarifications or explains why there is no need to amend the Recommendations.

101. In view of the wide support expressed by countries and organisations, the Conference is invited to endorse the recommendations, subject to amendments presented in this document, and to the outcomes of the discussion at the CES plenary session.

United Nations ECE/CES/2015/7

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
5 June 2015

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-third plenary session
Geneva, 15-17 June 2015
Item 6 (a) of the provisional agenda
Outcomes of the in-depth reviews carried out by the Conference of European Statisticians Bureau

Results of the consultation on the outcomes of in-depth reviews

Note by the Secretariat

Summary

This note summarizes the comments by members of the Conference of European Statisticians on outcomes of in-depth reviews carried out by the Bureau of the Conference. The Secretariat conducted the electronic consultation in April 2015.

A total of 32 replies were received in response to the request for comments: from 30 countries and 2 international organizations.

In view of the support expressed through the electronic consultation, the Conference will be invited to endorse the outcomes of the in-depth reviews on population projections, process oriented approach to statistical production, and measuring extreme events and disasters under agenda item 6(a).

The Conference will also be invited to discuss further work needed to improve measurement of labour mobility and globalisation under agenda item 6(b). The Bureau will decide on the possible way forward in this area in October 2015 based on the feedback received from the consultation and the discussion at the CES plenary session.

GE.15-09085 (E)
1509085

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. This note summarizes the comments by members of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) on the outcomes of in-depth reviews carried out by the CES Bureau in October 2014 and February 2015. The electronic consultation was conducted by the Secretariat in April 2015.

2. The purpose of the reviews is to improve coordination of statistical activities in the region of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), identify gaps or duplication of work, and address emerging issues. These reviews focus on strategic issues and highlight concerns of statistical offices of both a conceptual and coordinating nature.

3. A total of 32 replies were received in response to the request for comments from: Albania, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Eurostat and United Nations Statistics Division in New York.

II. Comments on the outcome of the in-depth review on labour mobility and globalisation

A. General comments on the way forward

4. All responding countries and organizations support the conclusions of the in-depth review paper, prepared by Austria, and make suggestions for further work priorities.

5. Many countries cited a specific need to first develop a conceptual framework to improve the measurement of labour mobility across statistical domains, countries, and organizations (Croatia, Colombia, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands and Portugal).

6. Several countries felt that harmonisation of general concepts and definitions was needed to improve the measurement of labour mobility (Belarus, Germany, Lithuania and Turkey). In particular, harmonization is needed between migration statistics, tourism statistics and national accounts, despite inherent difficulties of working across statistical domains (Albania, Croatia, Germany, Lithuania, Norway and Spain). Countries noted the need for technical assistance and practical guidance to improve the measurement of labour mobility.

7. Existing frameworks and resources should be used to as great an extent as possible, including relying on the Manual on Statistics of International Trade in Services and existing working groups on related issues like globalisation (Australia). Many countries stressed the importance of working in close coordination with ILO on this topic, in particular with the ILO Working Group on Labour Migration Statistics, to ensure coordination of work (Colombia, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan and Turkey). Good collaboration between statisticians and national authorities and with the academia should also be sought (Hungary and Tajikistan).

8. A number of countries described existing data sources and need for additional data to measure labour mobility. Utilization and integration of household surveys, administrative sources, and other alternative and innovative data sources were seen as necessary to improve knowledge on the topic (Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, Romania, Spain and Turkey).

B. Priority areas for the work of the Task Force

9. Countries expressed support for the new Task Force on Labour Mobility, and supported the following tasks as the priority areas:

(a) Many underlined as a priority task the development of a framework with common definitions and review of existing methodologies (Albania, Colombia, Croatia, Hungary, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Turkey).

(b) Many countries also supported a collection of good practices (Albania, Belarus, Colombia, Hungary, Lithuania, Netherlands, Tajikistan and Turkey). This should also be made available in Russian.

(c) Data exchange was deemed important for progressing on this topic (Albania, Colombia, Hungary, Netherlands, Spain and Turkey), though some countries expressed reservations on the detail of micro-data that could be exchanged (Sweden). How "mirror statistics" could be utilized by countries, and possible challenges involved, were also discussed by a few countries (Belarus and Mexico).

(d) An assessment of data availability and quality, and guidelines of how to best use and improve these data sources, was also suggested by some countries (Lithuania and Romania).

10. A number of additional issues were identified where the Task Force work could be beneficial, including solving difficulties of measuring short-term migrants (Belarus and Hungary) and tourists (Germany and Hungary), as well as "irregular" migrants, circular migrants and cross-border workers (Mexico).

11. Additional suggestions include restricting the scope of the work to employment work and not extend to all forms as work as defined in the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians' (ICLS) resolution (Germany), to not only cover the movement of persons but also the movement of jobs (United Nations Statistics Division), and to not include "globalisation" in the mandate for the proposed Task Force on Labour Mobility (Netherlands).

III. Comments on the outcome of the in-depth review on population projections

A. General comments

12. Countries expressed support to the outcome of the in-depth review by the Bureau and to the paper prepared by Canada and the United Kingdom. In addition, the following remarks were made:

(a) Armenia welcomed the activities proposed on population projections, adding that training courses on population projections have been conducted in the country with the support of the United States Census Bureau and the United Nations Population Fund to build the capacity of the relevant staff;

(b) Chile considered appropriate and of great importance the objectives for the Task Force on Population Projections proposed in the Terms of Reference. Chile noted also that according to the Terms of Reference, the work of the Task Force should focus on projections at the national and broad regional level, while projections for small areas (that is an area of concern in Chile) would not be considered;

(c) Germany agreed with the work proposed, and suggested the following amendments to the in-depth review paper: in annex A of the paper it should be added in the column "methodology notes" for Germany: Cohort component. Assumptions based on past trends, use expert advice on trends and analysis. In paragraph 73 Germany suggests using the term "to consider" (instead of "stay abreast") "micro simulations";

(d) Israel and the United States provided material and information on their population projections, to be considered for inclusion in the in-depth review paper;

(e) Italy observed that Istat has participated actively in all past Eurostat-UNECE meetings on projections, organizing two of them, namely in Perugia (1999) and in Rome (2013). Italy is also one of the members of the new Task Force;

(f) Norway commented on point 5a) in the review paper, noting that the priority should be making accurate projections (possibly developing and improving methods), and not ensuring comparability over time and between countries. It follows that it can be expected that different countries use different methods, also considering differences in needs and available resources. Similarly, it is not necessary to have a common time horizon. What is important is to document the methodology used and how the assumptions are developed. Norway noted that paragraph 39 in Annex A of the review paper (referring to Norway) should be moved up after paragraph 24 (this was also noted by the United States).

B. Views on the way forward

13. All responding countries and organizations support the CES Bureau decision to set up a Task Force on Population Projections to: (i) prepare a collection of good practices on communicating population projections to users; and (ii) provide guidance on the establishment of a UNECE database of metadata about national and international population projections.

14. In addition, some countries and organizations made the following comments or suggestions concerning the work proposed for the new Task Force on Population Projections, and more in general future work in the field of projections:

(a) Albania expressed its willingness to be part of the new Task Force;

(b) New Zealand expressed support for the work proposed, and suggested that projections (other than population projections) produced by each national statistical office and international organisation (e.g. labour force, family, household) should at least be included in the database (i.e. without necessarily going into detail). The reason indicated by New Zealand is that such projections are often inter-connected and complementary to population projections, and therefore collecting some limited information would form a useful basis for more in-depth inquiries by individual national statistical offices and/or UNECE at later dates;

(c) Norway expressed some reluctance to the proposal of a database of metadata on population projections, considering the burden on countries for reporting and updating, and suggested that a summary with links to all countries' own publications could be sufficient, encouraging countries to publish as much as possible metadata in English. Norway also provided some comments on communicating uncertainty and the use of the words "projections" and "forecasts", which will be shared with the Task Force. Finally, Norway considered as very useful the Eurostat/UNECE Work Sessions on Demographic Projections, and suggested holding them more frequently;

(d) The United States, with regard to the establishment of a new database of metadata about population projections, recommended including metadata for both the U.S.

national projections and the set of international projections produced for the US Census Bureau International Data Base (IDB);

(e) Eurostat confirmed its long-term commitment in the co-organization of Work Sessions on Demographic Projections (item II.3.E in the review paper), that are planned to be continued in the future.

IV. Comments on the outcome of the in-depth review on the process-oriented approach to statistical production

A. General comments

15. Countries widely recognise the need to move towards a process-oriented approach to statistical production, and many countries have taken measures in that direction. For example, Mexico has developed a national application of the model statistical system (The National System of Statistical and Geographical Information, SNIEG) as well as its own application of the process model of statistical production.

16. Several countries note (Hungary, Italy, Lithuania and Sweden) that the review paper, prepared by Turkey, provides a valuable collection of information on countries' activities related to the process-oriented approach to statistical production and makes good recommendations on possible follow-up actions.

17. Italy cautions about the coexistence of two reporting lines for the same structure as this might cause management problems during the transition from one organizational structure to the other. The transition to a new production approach requires a change in the vision of the whole organization.

18. The process-oriented approach applies also to international organizations. For example, an inventory of all existing regulations should be carried out to see whether they support process-oriented work or the stovepipe orientation.

B. Views on the way forward

19. All responding countries and organizations support the outcome of the in-depth review, i.e. the CES Bureau decision to organise a High-Level Seminar on Process-Oriented Approach to Statistical Production, to be organised jointly by Turkey and the High-Level Group for the Modernisation of Statistical Production and Services. The CES Bureau will consider further taking into account the following country priorities:

(a) Several countries underlined that the seminar should share experience from organizational changes (Australia, Belarus, Chile, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania and Netherlands), and provide latest information on the new standards and initiatives relating to the process-oriented approach (Belarus). The seminar should also discuss the common problems of introducing the process-oriented approach, such as resistance to change and difficulty of changing functions;

(b) Specific training activities are essential to support the required cultural change in national statistical offices and their human resources management, so that they start moving towards the process-oriented approach and overcome the stovepipe organization;

(c) Regarding the "to do" list, Chile expressed strong support for developing such a list and a knowledge base as their office is undergoing a strategic analysis to

improve the functional structure of the organization. Hungary on the other hand, indicated that the generic statistical production models, such as the Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM), the Generic Statistical Information Model (GSIM) or the Common Statistical Production Architecture (CSPA), are sufficient for describing the framework of a process-oriented organisation, and as the development of a simple but actionable "to do" list may be challenging (Hungary and Sweden), such a list is not needed as the first priority.

V. Comments on the outcome of the in-depth review on measuring extreme events and disasters

A. General comments

20. Countries noted that official statistics and statisticians can play an important role in measuring extreme events and disasters. Several countries appreciated the comprehensive and informative review paper.

B. Views on the way forward

21. All responding countries and organizations support the outcome of the in-depth review based on a paper by Mexico, and the CES Bureau decision to set up a Task Force on Measuring Extreme Events and Disasters. The aim of the Task Force will be to clarify the role of official statistics in providing data related to extreme events and disasters, and identify practical steps how national statistical offices can support disaster management with the relevant agencies. In addition, the following points were made:

(a) This work is closely linked to the work of the Steering Group on Climate Change-Related Statistics and also to the work of the Task Force on Set of Key Climate Change Indicators (Eurostat, Italy). An upcoming Expert Meeting for Producers and Users of Climate Change-Related Statistics (2-3 September 2015, Geneva) will include a session dedicated to Extreme Events and Disasters;

(b) It is important to link geographical information with statistics to measure extreme events and disasters, and collaborate with the United Nations Global Geospatial Information Management (UN-GGIM);

(c) The Framework for the Development of Environment Statistics includes a specific section on Extreme Events and Disasters which provides a starting point for the work (Italy);

(d) Collaboration with the European Environment Agency and the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission would improve synergies between statistical institutes and technical risk management (France and Sweden). The Joint Research Centre of the European Commission is carrying out a project called Disaster Loss Data in the European Union (EU) which aims to map out existing databases within the EU today and look into the possibility of developing an EU database with common standards that would be aligned with the United Nations models, tools and demands on loss databases and similar activities;

(e) The work links to issues discussed at the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction which was held in March 2015. The last sentence of point 3h reads: "Participation of statisticians … will be important" in that event. As this event was held, perhaps something could be said about the actual contribution made by statisticians or requests towards them from the World Conference;

(f) Chile informed of their interest to become an observer and later a member of the Task Force;

(g) United Kingdom noted that it might be worth considering what is required at the various stages of work based on identifying a few case studies – for example when planning risk reduction, during the disaster itself and afterwards. On point 6 c of the paper, it might be helpful to expand more on the link between the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting and measuring extreme events and disasters.

VI. Proposal

22. Given the support by countries, the Conference is invited to endorse the outcomes of the in-depth reviews on population projections, process oriented approach to statistical production, and measuring extreme events and disasters under agenda item 6(a).

23. The CES Bureau selected the topic of labour mobility and globalisation for discussion at the CES plenary session in June 2015 in Geneva. The Conference will be invited to discuss further work needed to improve measurement of labour mobility and globalisation under agenda item 6(b). The Bureau will decide on the way forward in this area in October 2015 based on the feedback received from the consultation and the discussion at the CES plenary session.

24. The Secretariat will forward the detailed comments by countries and organizations to the authors of in-depth review papers and the relevant Task Forces to be taken into account in further work.